Stuttgarter Beiträge zur Risiko- und Nachhaltigkeitsforschung

Meeting of Minds – European Citizens' Deliberation on Brain Sciences

Final Report of the External Evaluation

Rüdiger Goldschmidt and Ortwin Renn

Nr. 5 / Dezember 2006

Institut für Sozialwissenschaften
Abt. für Technik- und Umweltsoziologie
Prof. Dr. O. Renn
Universität Stuttgart

Meeting of Minds – European Citizens' Deliberation on Brain Sciences

Final Report of the External Evaluation

Rüdiger Goldschmidt and Ortwin Renn

Nr. 5 / Dezember 2006

Final Report

Institut für Sozialwissenschaften
Abt. für Technik und Umweltsoziologie
Universität Stuttgart
Seidenstr. 36, 70174 Stuttgart
Tel: 0711/685-83971, Fax: 0711/685-82487
Email: ortwin.renn@sowi.uni-stuttgart.de
Internet: http://www.uni-stuttgart.de/soz/tu

DIALOGIK gGmbH
Seidenstr. 36, 70174 Stuttgart
Tel: 0711/685-83971, Fax: 0711/685-82487
Email: info@dialogik-expert.de
Internet: www.dialogik-expert.de/

ZIRN
Internationales Zentrum für Kultur- und
Technikforschung der Universität Stuttgart
Interdisziplinärer Forschungsschwerpunkt
Risiko und Nachhaltige Technikentwicklung
Tel: 0711/685-83971, Fax: 0711/685-82487
Email: ortwin.renn@sowi.uni-stuttgart.de
Internet: http://www.zirn-info.de

Ansprechpartner:
Prof. Dr. Ortwin Renn
Rüdiger Goldschmidt
Tel: 0711 / 685-84295
renn@dialogik-expert.de
goldschmidt@dialogik-expert.de

The reports of the external evaluation team of Dialogik gGmbH were written by

Rüdiger Goldschmidt and Ortwin Renn

with assistance from
Max Eifler
Viola Schetula
Hannah Kosow

Contents

1   Description of the External Evaluation Process

1.1   Major Objectives of the External Evaluation

The major objective of the external evaluation is to review the methodological concept, the procedural design and the actual performance of the ECD-Project[1]. The focus of the evaluation lies on the European process level, i.e. the two Citizens' Conventions were the focal events for the external evaluation. After these events, the team of Dialogik accumulated the interim results in form of two reports, which are attached to this volume. The following conclusions are based on the insights described in these interim reports. They convey a more holistic picture of the overall process without getting lost in each detail.

---

[1] The acronym ECD stands for "European Citizens' Deliberation", which is the description of the basic method of the Meeting of Minds-Project. Both terms were used synonymously in this report. Meeting of Minds is an initiative of the partner consortium comprising the King Baudouin Foundation, the University of Westminster, the Flemish Institute for Science and Technology Assessment, the Danish Board of Technology, the Cité des Sciences et de l'Industrie, the Stiftung Deutsches Hygiene-Museum, the Fondazione IDIS Città della Scienza, the Rathenau Institute, the Science Museum, the University of Debrecen, the Eugenides Foundation, the University of Liège, SPIRAL. The initiative has the support of the European Commission under the 6th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development in the European Union.

The main research question of the evaluation is how the dialogue processes were initiated and how they were sustained during the whole project. The development of communication and deliberation leading to a common statement of European citizens about brain science was one major concern of this analysis, which focused on process-related and organizational issues.

The task to evaluate the ECD-Project was an inspiring but also demanding endeavour. A lot of data was collected during the process and an enormous n   umber of sources for additional information was available for further analysis. One problem to be solved was to find an adequate theoretically appropriate and practically feasible perspective for the examination of all important activities. The other problem was to find the right balance between measuring subjective impressions and evaluations based on a set of objective criteria or benchmarks. Subjective aspects such as the assessments of the participants are relevant, but a comprehensive assessment also needs additional information sources, which can be used as benchmarks for assessing successes or failures of the process. The methods used in this evaluation include both aspects.

1.2   Overview of the External Evaluation Procedure

The evaluation started with a comparison of the proposed participation process with other similar activities on the European level. One project , for example, was the nanotechnology program by the IRGC (International Risk Governance Council), another the Public Participating Project of the European Expert Group on Biotechnology. This comparison served more illustrative purposes since an external

evaluation had not been performed in these other projects. A systematic review was hence not feasible.

The evaluation team conducted interviews with members of the King Baudouin Foundation to gain impressions concerning the overall goals, basic intentions and expectations of the organizers (European project management). The results of these interviews were later compared with the perspectives of other participants of the ECD-Project, for example the stakeholders or Facilitators of the Convention.

The *core activities* of the evaluation consisted of two basic methods. First, the team members conducted **systematic observations** on the communication and interaction processes during crucial meetings on the European level, including the Citizens Conventions and Stakeholder Meetings. The following observation plan gives an overview on the events, dates and the type of observation.

1. First Citizens' Convention (Jun 2005)   Observation by 2 observers
2. First Stakeholder Workshop (Jun 2005)   Observation by 1 observer
3. Second Citizens' Convention (Jan 2006)   Observation by 3 observers
4. Policy Advice Workshop, ESOF (Jul 2006) Observation by 1 observer
5. Stakeholder Workshop 2006 (Sep 2006)   Online Workshop, 2 observers

Secondly, the team members conducted personal **face-to-face interviews** with key actors of the of the major events. In a few cases where a face-to-face interview was not possible due to time constraints, the team members arranged an interview by telephone. The interviews were scheduled in proximity of the dates of the Conventions whenever possible. 14 interviews were conducted in the working phase of the First Citizens' Convention, 13 interviews were completed in the following working phase. From a methodological viewpoint the methods used for the interviews belong to the qualitative instruments of issue-oriented, semi-structured exploration. All interviews were recorded digitally or by tape.

Some **additional measures** accompanied the core activities. One target was to scan the website of Meeting of Minds (www.meetingmindseurope.org) to gain impressions about the expectations, intentions and the assessments of key players of the process. As a result, the analysis covered the commentaries concerning the ECD-Project, especially shortly before or after the Conventions. A second target was the integration of the internal and external evaluation without violating the independence of the two approaches. A suitable method to find a common interpretation of the results from both routes of inquiry was to conduct an interview with the internal evaluator Alison Moore. The insights gained from this interview also assisted the evaluation team to link the results of the European level with those from each national exercise.

The analysis is based on a multi-method design (triangulation) which allows direct comparison between the results of several methods. Results of one method can be validated by data of the other methods. There is also the possibility to explain one result of method A by another result of method B.

2   Observation – Methods and Procedures

The design of the observation was adapted to the process and the activities of the two Conventions. Sometimes, the team members documented processes which included all citizens, for example during the plenary sessions. At other times, the observers focused on special groups of participants such as during the working phases at the discussion tables. The three observers who attended the Second Citizens' Convention jointly recorded the interactions that took place during the plenary sessions, while each observer focused on one Carousel during the Carousel activities. Basically, the observers were instructed to document the dynamics of all interactions and to report their impressions with respect to all relevant activities, including those that were not directly located in their observation field.

The observers used a pre-structured observation tool for the documentation. Each prepared evaluation sheet covered 15 minutes of observation time. The tool included global indicators as well as specific variables related to the process. Every indicator contained several sub-dimensions, which were listed on the observation sheet. The indicators were as follows:

Atmosphere   included all impressions concerning the general conditions of the discussion and focused on "internal" aspects related to the citizens. The dimension, for instance, explored the mood of the citizens, which was described by means of terms as relaxed – tensed or tired – not tired.

Interaction   characterized the style of communication and interaction of the citizens. The citizens of a round table, for

example, could have been focused on mutual understanding or on strategic reasoning to achieve special targets. The dimension also included aspects of strategic behaviour such as the question to whether actors formed fractions or alliances to achieve their targets. Another important aspect was how the citizens treated each other personally.

Discussion documented how the citizens participated in the discussion. They could have been following the process intensely or they could have been busy with other activities. Other items related to this dimension were, for instance, the relative contribution of each actor to the discussion as well as the resolution of open questions and conflicts.

Roles referred to an aggregate of sub-dimensions focusing on special functions of individual actors or small groups of actors during the deliberations. Questions as to who had taken an active role in the discussion and how this was legitimised and accepted were important in this context. For instance, if one citizen was taking a facilitation function based on his or her knowledge the observer documented it.

Opinion was orientated to all content-related aspects of the discussion. The main research interest in this category was the classification, which types of arguments were being used, for instance cognitive, evaluative or normative claims.

Language framed questions such as: Did the actors use popular, professional or scientific language or had the citizens' problems articulating themselves? It would have been reported, for instance, if members of an international discussion round had problems communicating in the table's dominant language or during the discussion of specifically complex subjects.

Structure   was the place for documenting all "external" influences on the observed process. One major interest here was to capture the effects of the Facilitators on the discussion rounds. The variable "Structure" also included an assessment of the question of how transparent the process was in the eyes of the citizens or whether the participants got opportunities to exert influence on methodological and content-related decisions. Additional aspects were the general support of the tables and the supply with background material: Were the participants satisfied with the quality and quantity of the material they received? Unexpected incidents and major problems were recorded at this point.

The measurement by the pre-structured observation sheet was accompanied by several additional instruments. The dimensions of the pre-structured tools were explained in depth by background information explaining the purpose and the structure of each dimension. In addition to using the pre-structured tools, the observers took individual notes. The Conventions were documented by tape and digital recording.

3 Interviews – Methods and Procedures

The aim of the interviews was to collect impressions concerning the expectations, perceptions and the assessments of all actors involved. The Lead-Facilitators who had major influence on the development of the methodological design and the structuring of the process were important interview partners as well as the other Facilitators, who had the responsibility to implement the chosen design. Included were also some of the major stakeholders and a small subset of the ordinary participants (the citizens).

The content of the interviews differed depending on the phase of the ECD-Project and the type of actor being interviewed. Basically, the questions addressed issues such as the subjective assessment of success or failure or the perception of the significance of the Conventions for reaching the overall goal of the project. Some of the interviews also included a personal evaluation and assessment of the methodological design – if the interview partner was related to the implementation of the design. Major topics covered during the interviews included (2. Convention):

- What were the main objectives of the ECD-Project from the perspective of the interviewed person and was the Convention perceived as successful in meeting these objectives?

- Did the expectations correspond with the perceived output of the process ?

- How did the respondents assess the quality of the process, for instance, regarding efficiency or design?

- How did the respondents identify their personal role in the process; how did they attempt to meet this role and did they feel well prepared for conducting their respective tasks?

- What kind of problems were perceived during the process and what kind of problems were expected in the future?

- Were they convinced that the ECD-Project was able to facilitate a European identity amongst the citizens and how did they describe the atmosphere of the Convention?

- How did the key actors perceive the degree of commitment of the citizens' as well as their (discourse-) competence?

- Looking at the methodology, how did the respondents judge the approach of the ECD-Project to incorporate science in the process and how did they evaluate the methods that were used to meet the purpose of the whole exercise? Were they satisfied with the methods of citizen involvement?

- Did they believe that every citizen had gotten a fair opportunity to contribute to the process and to the results?

- How did they assess and evaluate the role of the King Baudouin Foundation?

- How did the respondents estimate the influence of the ECD-Project on European policy and public participation?

4 Evaluation Criteria

The selection of indicators and their sub-dimensions was based on a set of evaluative criteria that guided our evaluation. These criteria refer to (Renn, 2004):

Fairness
This criterion requests that all relevant and affected actor groups have an equal opportunity to participate in the process (external or structural fairness). In addition, the criterion demands that the process offers fair conditions to all participants (internal or procedural fairness). Aspects of fairness include, for instance, the conditions and constraints of the process, the rules and provisions regulating the dialogue and explicitly the development of agreement. These rules should be defined beforehand and consensually (Webler, 1995, p.62f).

Competence
This criterion refers to a sufficient level of communicative and issue-related proficiency. Participants should be able to assess the consequences of their preferences with respect to different decision options and measures. Competence also includes the ability to communicate and to exchange norms, values or emotional expressions (Habermas, 1992, S.260).

Transparency
This criterion demands that all methods, proceedings and rules, but also the produced results are openly communicated to all persons involved. Optimal is a balance between availability of information (quantity

	as well as quality) and mutual understanding of all viewpoints.
Efficiency	This criterion specifies the relation between effort (time, money, etc.) and result. The efficient use of all resources including the time of the participants is of major importance for the subjective satisfaction with the process as well as for the goal of optimal allocation.

5   Empirical Results of the Evaluation

This report summarises the final conclusions of the external evaluation based on a broad range of empirical data. The results of 27 interviews with key actors and the observation results of the dialogues during the First and Second Citizens' Convention serve as a main source of the analysis. The evaluation also considers the insights gained by the comparison of the ECD-Project with similar initiatives on the European level. Other sources for the evaluation include the comments regarding the project located at the website of the ECD-Project and the data from an interview with the leader of the internal evaluation. Different documents such as the European Citizens' Assessment Report, but also notes taken during Steering Committee Meetings etc., were also incorporated in the interpretation of the data.

5.1   Basic Design of the Process (External Fairness)

The basic design of the ECD-Project can be separated in a preparation phase, the citizens' meetings and the follow-up-phase.

The **preparation phase** included a workshop of experts, which can be seen as the base of the project. One outcome of this event was the book "Connecting Brains and Society. The present and the future of brain science: what is possible and what is desirable?" The book presents the experts' contributions to this workshop. This starting point can be basically assessed as positive in spite of the fact that there were a few disadvantageous connotations.

This book provided a base of knowledge, which had been transferred in more illustrative text samples for the citizens. A short brochure gave an overview on major subjects and issues of brain science. The brochure was highlighted as an adequate preparation tool by a lot of interview partners, which underlies its importance and also signals its function as an informative guide to the subject.

The organizers focused hence on the knowledge aspects with respect to subject brain sciences. But, knowledge refers to only one dimension of the subject. Not adequately included were different (scientific) perspectives on the subject in the phase of preparation, especially when addressing the issue of desirability as the title of the book suggests. The list of contributors of the book consists of a lot of significant experts in the field of neurosciences etc.. Only a minority of experts is related to philosophical or ethical disciplines or to the field of technology assessment. The social and ethical perspective of brain-science-related technology was clearly underrepresented. This dominance of technical knowledge influenced the first deliberations among citizens and shaped the assessments during the dialogues.

Another point that was also mentioned by several participants is that non-scientific stakeholders other than technical experts had not been involved in this important phase which led to the presumption that the experts perspective was seen as the main frame for looking at and analysing the topic. Had stakeholders and citizens also been involved in the framing phase the variety of perspectives could have been wider than it was accomplished in the project.

The **"sampling" of citizens** was another important aspect of the preparation. The citizens panel consisted of 126 persons. 14 lay-persons were randomly selected controlling for diversity regarding age, gender and education (cf. Meeting of Minds Partner Consortium: European Citizens' Assessment Report, p.10). With a size of 126 persons, the European panel did not represent the citizenship of Europe in a statistical understanding. There are different suggestions how many cases are needed so that a sample can represent a population. The smaller the number of people drawn into a sample and the larger

the population that the sample is supposed to represent the larger will be the confidence interval for any result using inferential statistics. With very small sample sizes inferential statistical tools cannot be applied. Rather than representing the entire population the goal of the project was to ensure diversity. The central question has been how much diversity exists in the sample so that all relevant arguments are at least represented once. The evaluation came to the result that a high degree of diversity had been achieved. The main panel was large enough to guarantee a broad range of individual life experiences, attitudes and opinions as well as social backgrounds. The citizens' comments in the web-log at the Meeting-of-Minds-Homepage illustrated that a significant number of the citizens felt attached to this subject because of personal experiences. Many explained their interest in the project with the fact that members of their families were affected by brain diseases.

A first national meeting took place before the elaborations phase. The objective was to give panel members the opportunity to get to know each other and to familiarize themselves with the ECD-Process. Statements of the coordinators and citizens indicate that this objective has been mainly accomplished.

The **elaboration phase** of the citizens' deliberations can be divided into five components: two European meetings (in June 2005 and in January 2006) and three national assessment meetings. The basic design of the two European meetings differed. The First Citizens' Convention was modelled after the 21st Century Townhall-Meeting developed by "America Speaks". The main objective for the citizens was to develop a common European agenda of important subjects regarding brain sciences (Themes) and to prioritise these subjects for the discussions during the national assessment meetings.

The national assessment meetings were modelled after the Consensus Conference developed by the Danish Board of Technology. Here the Themes, worked out in the First Convention, were assessed by the national panels summarizing their results in a national report. All these reports were pooled into the National Synthesis Report, which

served as a basic tool of the Second Convention. It was important that the citizens got the opportunity to explore the subjects gradually during the intermediate phase of the national assessments, to reflect these subjects and to request further information from the national resource persons.

The Second Citizens' Convention followed a complete new design – the Carousel Design. The whole European panel was divided into 3 groups (Carousels) with mixed nationality. Every participant was able to speak his or her native language, i.e. the participants within every Carousel were separated per nationality. Each Carousel had to elaborate two Themes in detail aiming for recommendations that had to be approved by the whole European panel as a means to develop commonly shared recommendations for the final report.

Because the overall objective was to constitute an European dialogue, the **basic order of the citizens meetings** was structured accordingly. The European citizens worked out an agenda for the most important subjects, which were assessed at national level and after this, the European Panel developed the final recommendations.

The alternative procedure of articulating explicit statements by the national panels, before the European Meeting had started, would have decreased the scope for the European dialogue. The advantage of the design chosen by the organizers is that the citizens were able to gain experiences with the European dialogue before the national assessments started. The self-perception as being European rather than national panellists can be seen as an important factor contributing to the overall success. The climate of a European discourse would have been destroyed if the process had turned into bargaining between national players. At the same time, the national sensitivities and particularities constituted an important component of the discourse that had to be included in a tangible form, such the Synthesis Report.

Basically, the interactive design between national and European level turned out to be successful. The interaction of the national with

European level will probably enhance the chance that the final results of the ECD-Project will influence the policy level at both the national and the European level.

The **evaluation of the Conventions' basic design** is focused on the relationships between stated objectives and accomplished results. The implementation of the basic design is another topic for evaluation, which will be covered in the section on procedural aspects.

In general, the tow basic designs of the Conventions worked as intended. The objectives of each of the two events had been achieved and problems, that occurred during the processes, were due to implementation deficits rather than the overall design.

The design of the First Citizens' Convention included the setting of the major topics within a larger policy framework and the task of prioritising these topics by the participants. The citizens developed a common agenda of Themes from a broad variety of subjects, whereby the selection process included iterative reflection periods in the plenary sessions.

The plenary sessions can generally be seen as an "agora" – a place which gave citizens the opportunity to explore, correct and expand the scope of Themes. During all plenary sessions decision making was founded on a broad base of consensus, a procedure that secured and legitimised all final results of the process.

The design of the First Convention also fostered a feeling for the European level. The table design can be characterized as a very solid, efficient and flexible way of organizing dialogues. The interactions seemed to be more lively than in most of the discourse-contexts during the Second Convention. But, this impression can also be a result of the procedural conditions of the Second Convention.

The objective of the Second Convention was to evaluate the existing results from the national assessments to further develop them into final recommendations. There was not enough time to discuss all aspects of each Theme. The Carousel-Design, which mainly consists

in dividing the European panel into 3 smaller groups, secured that at least two aspects of every Theme were elaborated in detail by each Carousel with reference to the Synthesis Report.

The design of second European meeting strengthened the national interactions more than the design of First Citizens' Convention. As mentioned above, the participants within a Carousel were often separated by nationality. With regard to the narrow time-frame, this constraint is acceptable. But, it limited an expansion to include the European level.

The citizens were able to develop their own perspective on the Synthesis Report. They did not rely on the national assessments during the Second Convention at national tables. The crucial problem of a mixed-table design would have been the organization of the language interpretation for all 3 Carousels. The problem would occur as soon as the Carousel plenary sessions would have been divided into smaller units for separate discussions. This would have increased the complexity for multi-language translation and, finally, the costs of the event significantly. For this reason, the methodological decision to constitute monolingual tables within the Carousels can be judged acceptable.

An alternative could have been to use the Townhall-Design a second time for the elaboration of recommendations during the Second Convention. One advantage of this concept is that the mixed tables could work separately on the different subjects so that a broader selection of aspects for every Theme could have been discussed. This would have increased, however, the amount of material to handle in the European dialogue. The recommendations of such a design would have a smaller base because they were elaborated only at single tables. The recommendations of the Carousel-Design were worked out in a dialogue among approximately 40 people. This "pre-rating" by bigger groups of participants can be seen as a supportive factor for the development of consensus in the plenary sessions.

The basic methodological design of the entire process and its components worked well. Both Conventions reached the major objectives

articulated by the organisers. The Carousel-Method, however, limited the inclusion of the European dimension, which can be explained by practical constraints. The problem of language interpretation illustrated the complexity of the Carousel Design, so that one intention during the implementation of this design should be to simplify the proceeding.

The evaluation identified several problematic aspects when it comes to the implementation of the basic designs. The following sections provide a summary of these procedural problems. The reports in Annex A and B present the detailed findings regarding the two Conventions.

5.2   Evaluation of the Convention-Process (Procedural Fairness)

One of the most influential constraints in both Conventions was the **time-pressure**, that sometimes exerted a negative effect on the quality of the discourse. Especially during the Second Convention, the meetings were extremely long with a high density of working phases for each day. This "overload" physically challenged all participants and decreased their chances to participate actively in the dialogue. The resulting tiredness diminished the citizens' commitment and fostered activities of diversion.

The scheduling was demanding. If one processes needed more time than scheduled, the time loss had to be regained in the following phase. This conditions generally inhibited a free discourse and reduced the opportunities to express and explore alternative perspectives. The time constrains initiated or intensified other problems. Sometimes, citizens reported to us that the language interpretation was not capable to keep up with the speed of the process, which occasionally caused incorrect translations. The citizens, as well as the

persons responsible, needed time to come to terms with the proceedings so that the discussions often began with a certain degree of confusing. Occasionally, dialogue came about as the time for the specific task was over.

The quality of dialog was also influenced by a **tendency of over-proceduralization**, which may be related to the time constraints. Especially during the Second Convention was the dialogue regulated and constrained by an elaborated system of rules and definitions. The resulting complexity of the discourse increased the "cognition load" and caused ambiguities and irritations. Some irregularities and inconsistencies with respect to the many rules and regulations added to the confusion. A simplified rule system would have increased the opportunities to participate more actively and creatively in the dialog especially during the Second Convention. The citizens comprehended the tasks and procedures of the First Convention better than the ones governing the Second Convention. This impression was clearly confirmed in the responses of the participants to the evaluation survey.

The finding can be illustrated by focussing on the voting rules, which created confusion and turned out to be even counterproductive at times. A recommendation needed a two-third-majority to pass. Several recommendations did not pass this threshold. So they were rejected without any further discussion. This led to frustration on the side of the participants and did not contribute to the achievement of the desired results.

The "filtering of recommendations" by the two-third-rule is inspired by the intention to have a broad consensus, but it favours the articulation of broad communalities and impedes explicit and pointed results. The legitimacy of the final result of dialog would not be compromised if the organisers had collected these recommendations allowing for extended diversity rather than restricting the scope to near consensual matters.

The **voting procedure of the two European Citizens' Meetings** differed, so that a comparison of the two modes can be made. The keypad voting during the First Citizens' Convention required some technical preparation but seemed to be efficient and transparent, as soon as the rules of voting were clear. The citizens gave their votes anonymously and they were able to hide the keypad during the voting, so that other participants could not control the individual vote. The collected data was presented quickly on the screen for all persons involved and it was easy to present it in relation with other data.

The observers got the impression, that not all citizens were aware of how to use the keypad correctly. The downside of this anonymous model of voting is that the process and the results can not be physically monitored. Nobody knows if a participant was using the keypad in the intended manner.

This procedure needs clear and transparent instructions and enough "training sessions" for the participants to familiarise themselves with the technical equipment and its intended use. The pad-modus implies trust in technology, whereby small errors might have occurred regarding the analysis and presentation of the collected data. Yet, the voting system seemed to have worked well in most instances.

The voting during the Second Citizens' Convention was conducted by hand signal. The votes were counted by the support team thereby risking incorrect counting. But the results can be (and were) recounted and the direct voting of the citizens can be easily controlled. The expression of the individual opinion is also visible for the other citizens, which constitutes a merit and a risk. On one hand side, citizens know immediately how many share their votes. On the other hand, social control may affect the individual choice. When observing the voting behaviour, there were some indications of such a social control. Due to the lack of anonymity, the voting process was more shaped by a social process. In comparison to the pad-counting method, the voting results of the Second Convention were only promulgated.

The experience of the two Conventions demonstrated that the different modes of voting have their advantages and disadvantages. It depends on the conditions of the process which mode one should choose. Another factor for the decision are the preferences, intentions and objectives of the organisers. The technical solutions seems to be more comfortable and produces more possibilities of presenting and displaying results, especially if the number of participants is high. Using the pad-mode, however, needs more training sessions and additional monitoring of the technical abilities of the participants. The hands-up voting process is easier to grasp, transparent to all participants, and easy to implement. This open voting process does not respect anonymity of voting and may lead to social pressure. One crucial dimension for the selection is the desired separation of individual and collective votes, a feature that is provided by the pad-voting system. It can be seen as a bonus in gaining methodological experience that the Meeting of Minds process tested both voting modes.

5.3   Transparency

The subtlety of the rule system impacts on process control as well as process efficiency, especially when a high number of actors is involved. An elaborated rule system is not a problem in itself. On the contrary, the structuring of a complex situation by elaborated rules can foster mutual interaction if the rules are transparent to and consistent for all participants. The First Citizens' Convention provided more transparency to the participants, but in sum the internal transparency was not fully given during both Conventions.

The mass of material, the overwhelming amount of discussion points and the sophisticated conditions of the procedures created too much complexity which was and could not be resolved. During the Second

Citizens' Convention, a lack of transparency could be observed in three different aspects:

- Lack of transparency regarding the proceeding: The citizens sometimes did not understand their specific task and had difficulties to orient themselves with respect to the phase and its corresponding task.

- Lack of transparency regarding the procedures and methods: The participants had no clear overview on the most important design features or rules.

- Lack of transparency regarding the content: There were problems with the visualisation of the discussion results.

The complexity in relation to the transparency problems of the Second Convention did not only create problems at the operative level such as irritations and confusion. It also produced the need for additional explanation and legitimisation of rules by the Facilitators. The rule system seemed to be "fluid", to some extent from the perspective of the citizens. The regulations were not fully comprehensible for the citizens.

Our analysis concluded that especially the design of the Second Convention placed more attention on structural components such as the setting of rules. The process-component of interaction received less attention resulting in a negative influence on the dialogue.

This can be illustrated by the fact that valuable time was used to find an optimal presentation style for the visualisation of the dialogs' outputs. Using Power-Point-Slides was much more effective than flipcharts. The modus of how the content was documented on the slides was permanently altered during the dialogue. Nevertheless the visualisation of the content was not perfect until the end of the process. Entries were ambiguous or they were matched together. Sometimes citizens did not recognize their statements leading to irritations and interruptions of the process. In severe cases citizens rebelled against the interpretations of their entries as they appeared on the screen.

Improving the visibility of outputs would have served the interaction as well as the climate of the dialogue.

The mass of unstructured material aggravated the process. Nobody - the citizens as well as the Lead-Facilitators or the members of the support team etc. - were able to remember all the results worked out in the processes before. Such procedural problems should have been anticipated beforehand and solved before the events start.

One adequate regulation could have been that the statements of the citizens be documented completely but every speaker ought to be advised to give a short version of his contribution explicitly for the slide-presentation, which could serve as a base for the discussion. The discussions during the plenary sessions finally could come up with a short summary of the collected contributions. Such comprised results could be easily developed, rapidly elaborated and effectively voted on.

Much time of the Second Convention was spent to read and to translate (!) the very long and unstructured statements. In the final phase of the process, the translation of these statements for the discussions in the national groups caused a problem. The extensive amount of material that was produced in the discussion rounds before multiplied the problems and produced a growing disenchantment of the participants with the process.

The "veto" of the citizens in the last phase of the Second Convention can be seen as a consequence of these problems. The working results of the three different Carousels were inadequately summarised by the persons responsible for the final presentation. This was not accepted by the citizens. One reason for this can be seen in the lack of transparency about the recording process, another reason may have been the lack of involvement of the authors of each statement in rephrasing the different items.

In the First Convention, the writing was in hands of the "Theme Team", which had the task to summarise the discussion results. This unit was visible to all participants and served a symbolical function

in the dialogue. This visibility was absent during the Second Convention. The results of each working-session disappeared after the session. Each participant had no other choice but to believe that what was summarised later by anonymous team members were indeed the substance of what had been produced in the dialogue. A few citizens participated in the writers groups but their work was not visible for the remaining participants. The citizens were not informed that the presented slides contained only the short version of the Carousels' output. In light of these facts, the veto of the citizens was an understandable reaction.

Both Convention processes suffered from a lack of transparency to some degree. The participants lacked an adequate, comprehensive and precise overview on the rules and processes. Another issue of missing transparency referred to the necessary but not openly performed simplification of the discussion results achieved during the process. Additionally, all persons involved should be exposed to the same level of information, which should be available at all times (fairness). The operative availability of the output and the possibility of having access to the commonly shared results creates security, orientation and increases the identification with the process. This serves the dialogue on an operative as well as on a symbolical level and is more of an organizational than a technical issue.

5.4   Interaction and Involvement (Internal Fairness)

The preparation of the process was governed by strong efforts of the organisers to optimise the design and to develop a structure that serves the purpose of a multi-lingual and multi-cultural participation process. This focus was certainly justified giving the innovative character of the project. But it came with a price: less effort had been in-

vested in facilitating the interactions among the citizens and to show flexibility and adaptive capabilities vis-à-vis a growing concern of the participants with respect to the rigidity of the rules and the process. "Controlling" the process only by rules does not seem to be the most effective mode for developing a productive dialogue.

One finding of the observations was that the dynamics of interaction changed in the course of the process. The discussions during the Second Convention were sometimes lively, at other times slow. But when it turned slow and cumbersome, there was no early warning signal installed that would have alerted the organisers, let alone that contingency plans for flexible responses were in place. Another problem refers to involvement. A high degree of involvement and the possibility of real participation in the process correlates with the quality and intensity of the interaction. The side conditions of the discourse – the overstuffed schedule, the time problems, the lack of transparency – had a negative impact on the process itself, but they also created disincentives for personal involvement. This can be illustrated by the most stressful event of the Second Convention, in which the normal rules of the dialog had been suspended.

The "crisis" on Sunday can be seen as a turnover of process control. The citizens decided how they wanted to proceed. This moment of self-control increased the commitment and involvement of the citizens. They almost burst into activity and creative problem solving. The envisioned output was developed more quickly and efficiently than during the previous highly regulated process. The citizens decided to proceed as planned notwithstanding that the process did not run optimal.

The time pressure had even increased because the citizens in the Plenary had to regain the time that they had lost during the debates about the crisis and how to cope with it. Even under the new crisis structure, it was impossible to review all the material worked out in the working days before so that the transparency of the content did not improve. However, it was clearly visible that the citizens felt in-

volved and engaged as they took over control and proceeded according to their own pace.

The decision to proceed was legitimised by citizens vote. The participants had empowered themselves and took over the role as decision-makers and partners not only on the topics but also on the process. An analogue "shift of power" was also detected in the First Citizens' Convention.

There were other procedural problems worth mentioning: several participants complained about the noise level that accumulated during the discussion rounds, but this is hard to avoid if such a large number of participants is involved. With regard to the high complexity of the process, it is essential to control the quantity of the distributed material. Hardcopies and files should be labelled with date and origin by one standard for a better traceability.

Having made this critical remarks, it should be noted, however, that the available final subjective judgments of the participants were mostly favourable with respect to perceived transparency and fairness. But not all opinions were available. Almost 50% of the citizens did not participate in the final citizens surveys of the internal evaluation. It is not clear what the judgement of the other 50% might have been.

An explanation for the positive assessments is that the citizens were committed to their work, the results and the process. They did not question the methodological or procedural architecture of the design or the process as a whole but they demanded improvements when the problems seemed to accumulate. The citizens' comments in the web-log confirm the finding.

Influence of Gender: Gender issues are also a major element of internal fairness. First, the question is whether female participants were equally represented in the various samples and were able to have equal speaking opportunities. Second, the topics discussed during the two Conventions should include implications for gender aspects and

give them sufficient room in the deliberations. With respect to the first aspect, the composition of the citizens panels was clearly well balanced between men and women. This applied for the national panels but also for the European level. This balance was not given with the group of experts who were predominantly male. For instance, the imbalance was detected among the participants of the European Workshop "Connecting Brains and Society" in 2004, in the national groups of resource persons as well as in the group of resource persons of the Second Convention. One reason for this can be seen in the dominance of men in the focal scientific fields of the ECD-Project. At the highest management level, i.e. the Partner Consortium, there was a balanced gender-ratio. Overviews such as a table of participating actors (beside the citizens) document that also the rate among the "functional participants" was almost balanced between men and women.

During the discussions Facilitators were eager to provide equal speaking opportunities to men and women. In the beginning, men sometimes started conversations, but in the course of time men and women became equally engaged in mutual exchanges of ideas and arguments. There was no unbalanced contribution-activity detected regarding the gender aspect. There were also an equal number of women and men reporting as representatives from the various subgroups. In general the criterion of equal speaking opportunities was met during both Conventions.

Gender issues were not explicitly introduced into the deliberations by the resource persons or the Facilitators. However, several of the stakeholders addressed this issue and pointed out that brain sciences may have different implications for men or women. These issues were then discussed during the deliberations of the citizens but they did not become salient aspects of their recommendations or were explicitly included in their policy advise. The discussions among the citizens reached the conclusion that brain science offers opportunities and risks for both men and women and that a distinction was not taken into account. It might have been considered in future trials of

participatory technology assessment to make the gender-specific issues more prominent in the framing of the problems. Whether this would have made a difference in the case of brain science, is doubtful, however. In general, gender issues were addressed during the deliberations but did not reach any prominent status.

Influence of culture: Symbolic but also cultural factors influenced the entire process of the ECD-Project. For instance, it was necessary that the Lead Facilitator apologized for mistakes to calm down critical situations, what was an important symbol for the participants.

The perceptions and attitudes of the key actors were strongly related to their professional or social background within and outside the ECD-Project. Although all interviewees shared a common base of perceptions, they could be grouped into three different categories: Stakeholders, Organizers and Facilitators. Each category was related to special forms of communication, interaction patterns and practical experiences with the issues. The variance of perceptions and assessments was larger between the groups than within each group, This indicates that each actor group has its own perspective and its own perception of involvement in the process.

One of the problems during the First Convention was that the Facilitators had not been involved deeply enough in the preparation. They were excluded from the preparation phase and joined the process at the beginning of the implementation phase. The interviewed Facilitators mentioned that this condition caused avoidable problems during the First Convention. The Facilitators also shared the impression that they were not treated as key partners in the ECD-Project. The analysis concluded that the Facilitators' style of leadership had a strong influence on the dialogue and therefore on the formation of the results. It was an important improvement that the Facilitators were more involved and better instructed during the preparation phase of the Second Convention. This optimised the cooperation between the persons and increased the efficiency of the process.

In both Conventions there was a lack of involvement of the citizens. The incidents that occurred during the Conventions can be interpreted as result of the fact that the citizens were not fully involved as partners. They were treated as units of the process that had to produce the envisioned output. The citizens were well aware of this. They remained, however, committed to their work, focused on the results and played along with the process. The lack of participation and involvement in the process was also detected during the First Citizens' Convention.

5.5   Competence and Quality of Interaction

One of the major findings was that the citizens proved to be reliable and stress-resistant but also very competent partners. This turned out to be a major factor for the success. The citizens were definitely able to contribute and they wanted to participate as equal partners.

The introduction into the subject matter was excellent. The information brochure distributed by the King Baudouin Foundation was explicitly praised by most of the interviewed actors. A vast majority of participants confirmed (citizens survey of the internal evaluation) that the case studies constituted a useful reference for the development of the Themes in the First Citizens' Convention.

The citizens accumulated knowledge by the ECD-Process itself, but it can be assumed that they searched and used also a lot of additional information sources. Their competence to deal with the subject in the discussions as well as their general communicative performance increased during the meetings.

The resource persons delivered valuable additional stimuli to the citizens. The involvement of experts was beneficial to the respon-

dents. An important finding of the evaluation was that the citizens found the knowledge base useful in forming their own opinions and judgments. In short, they felt they had learned something that was crucial for the formation of their attitudes and evaluations.

The resource persons at times had an undue influence on the results, which they themselves criticised in the interviews. But none of the resource persons performed the judgmental part of the process. From a methodological perspective it is interesting to explore in which way and at what time the resource persons should be involved in the process. The discussions during the First Citizens' Convention would have benefited from the attendance of a few resource persons. Some knowledge questions remained open so that several aspects could not be adequately addressed by the citizens. But principally, the approach to involve the resource persons after the agenda-setting at the First Convention was positive, because the citizens were enabled to develop their own perspective based on sufficient background knowledge. The involvement of resource persons after the first citizens' meeting was important in order to enrich the agenda of Themes with concrete background information; for example, by answering open questions. During the Second Convention, the resource persons delivered inputs before the dialogue sessions started, but a few times the resource persons also had direct influence on the content of the summary slides.

It is an open question of how much "direct" influence the resource persons should have in participatory processes. With the experience of the Second Convention, the direct participation of experts in the discussion rounds did not interfere with the formation of independent judgments and evaluations by the citizens. At that time the citizens had developed sufficient sovereignty in their own capability to form balanced judgements so that expert advise was considered but not taken as a prescription.

As indicated earlier, the expert groups was limited to natural and technical scientists. It would have been better to provide citizens with a wider range of expertise, in particular because the issues discussed

during the two Conventions have strong ties with social sciences and the humanities. In addition, it might have been good to have policy makers invited to give testimony about their view of the subject in order to see the transitions from knowledge to political action. The involvement of policy-makers could have also enhanced the compatibility between the desired actions and their political and legal implementability. There is no doubt that the mode of expert involvement needs to be clearly regulated but different models and levels of interactions are possible. The concept chosen by the ECD-Project proved to be enlightening for the citizens but it was not complete.

The interaction between the citizens and the experts was, hence, constructive and trustful. Both actor groups were interested in listening, understanding and reflecting the arguments of "the other side". This exchange between competences can be seen as an important outcome of the Convention. There was a mutual interest of both sides to deepen the contact. For instance, the panel from the United Kingdom planned to visit a laboratory for getting more information.

The contributions of the experts in the events enriched the knowledge of the citizens. By the same token, the resource persons praised the competence of the citizens, so that the participation was obviously a beneficial experience for both parties.

Turning to the second element of competence, communicative competence, the picture is less favourable. The citizens were less prepared to follow the procedures and had difficulties in understanding the working conditions, especially during the Second Convention. This was a result of the side conditions described above. An exchange of arguments was generally possible but sometimes the opportunities of interaction were limited, especially during the Second Convention. The Conventions were unnecessarily burdened with too much material and too many rules. This did have an effect on personal involvement and enthusiasm but it did not compromise the quality of the recommendations articulated by the citizens. They demanded that problems were addressed and solved and stopped the dialogue

when they felt the quality of results was jeopardised. The most dramatic example for this finding was the "crisis" in the Second Convention.

Obviously, the citizens followed another rationality than the process initiators had assumed. The citizens wanted to care for the quality of the output and were less interested in methodological or procedural issues. Their expectations were guided by the National Synthesis Report and the national assessments. From the design, the objective of the dialog was to produce a "good enough"-result. The persons in charge also stressed several times that the concrete wording of the output was not central to the dialogue. The citizens did not share this perspective. They wanted to be comprehensive and precise. Terms, words and expressions were important for them and they refused when Facilitators or the writing team changed the expressions that they had used.

A better involvement of the citizens in structuring and designing the process and a more intense communication on these issues during the events would have decreased the difference between these two perspectives. This is the task of the process management.

Our recommendation is to open the methodological decision making and the writing process for the citizens. For this purpose there are modes of participation available that are less intensive than the content related procedures. A small team of citizens could prepare some of the methodological options and all participants could vote in the beginning by deciding which route they would like to follow. Such a procedure would legitimise the existence and necessity of rules and procedures and help to achieve commitment. It also would increase transparency by declaring the rules as well as the proceeding and it would be an important symbolic act.

An important positive result of the process was that the entire ECD-Project constituted a common **European Identity** and a feeling for a "European citizenship" within the project. The participants some-

times conducted hard discussions, which offered a lot of controversial potential. This does not come as a surprise since the subject of brain science is a highly controversial issue. Despite national differences, all European participants jointly developed the report and they generally interacted in an open, mutual trustful way focused on reaching an agreement. Together, the citizens defended the results of their work. This can be seen as an illustration not only of their commitment but also of their understanding of the European dimension.

A special challenge of the European Events was **language**. The need for interpretation into another language will always be present when citizens of different countries participate in an European dialogue. Collecting a sample that consists only of English speaking citizens does not seem to be the optimal alternative, because it excludes many potential participants. The language interpretation is crucial for a European dialogue and is surely a logistical challenge that is not easy to meet.

A special problem of translation is to carry along the cultural meaning associated with special phrases from one language to another. This is, to some extent, a question of qualified staff and, at least, of professional equipment. The organizers met these conditions.

The citizens acted very pragmatically and they were capable of overcoming national or linguistic boarders during the breaks and beyond. One aspect of citizens' competence was that the participants requested explanations if they had the feeling that statements were unclear or ambiguous. They wanted to be assured that the translation was given the intended perspectives to the other participants. Problems regarding the interpretation of expressions were often solved by direct interaction and communication and, normally, an agreement was quickly found. The side conditions aggravated these evolving agreements, especially during the Second Convention. The process ran too fast, so that the language interpretation was not able to keep up with the speed of the dialogue.

Non English-speaking citizens experienced disadvantages in the process because they were not able to read the slides documenting the results of the current dialogue. When the language interpretation delivered the translations too late because the process ran too fast, the problem aggravated. The citizens at the tables helped each other in order to master this deficit. Sometimes the citizens requested a recapitulation, so in most cases the problems were clarified.

The possibilities of the interpreters to interact with the citizens differed between the two Conventions. The interpreters of the First Citizens Convention attended the discussion rounds during the table sessions. In spite of the more formal translation process, the interactions appeared to be more lively and intensely compared to the settings of the Carousel arrangement. Another advantage of the First Convention setting was that the interpreters were able to observe the reactions of the citizens. The interpreters of the Second Convention worked separately from the discussion rounds. Sometimes, the interpreters seized the opportunity to comment when being confronted with ambiguous statements. Some brief interactions between the citizens at the tables and the interpreters occurred in a few situations. The citizens often used gestures to express themselves.

Obscurities and misinterpretations were not only a problem in the multilingual contexts. A number of monolingual dialogues were directed to develop an agreement regarding the understanding and interpretation of terms. Thus the language interpretation should not be seen as the only communication problem. The identification and the exploration of cultural differences regarding the meaning of terms and expressions turned out to be a major problem but was also a challenging opportunity to build a common understanding of terms and concepts. The ECD-Project was a pioneering project for a Trans-European process that included different languages and different cultural perspectives. In general, these challenges were well met and agreement in spite of these differences was accomplished.

The translation supported the process. Multilingual citizens sometimes monitored the interpretation and intervened when they be-

lieved the translation did no cover the meaning of what was said. This constituted an additional factor of control within the dialogue.

5.6   Internal Efficiency

The citizens developed a common statement of European citizens concerning the subject brain science. This means, that the first major objective of the project was achieved. In addition to the Citizens' Final Assessment Report, the completion of a National Synthesis Report indicated that also the second major objective was met: to bring citizens from different countries and backgrounds together and have them draft a common statement. The National Synthesis Report served as the basic tool during the Second Citizens Convention and was highly accepted by the citizens. The participants forged a strong link between the two reports.

The actors whom we interviewed, but also the contributors during the ESOF-dissemination workshop, basically gave positive assessments of the results and the entire project. This impression can be affirmed by the external evaluation. For instance, the outcome of the First Citizens' Convention consisted of a broad variety of Themes and questions, which the citizens had elaborated over a brief period of time.

The accomplishments of the dialogue can be seen as another important outcome in itself, because the Meeting of Minds-Project has a unique position in comparison to other initiatives in the field of Technology Assessment. This has been the first comprehensive attempt to start a participatory dialogue on the European level across cultural as well as language borders. The process itself, as well as the results of this dialogue, can be seen as an important symbol for proving the feasibility of public governance on a large European-wide scale. It also stands for an approach of social decision making, which

not only includes policy makers, experts or scientists but also ordinary citizens. They were at the centre of the process because they will be directly affected by the future developments in this field and the regulatory provisions governing this development and the applications. The ECD-Project is one of the first projects which has given "ordinary citizens" the opportunity to raise an "official voice" on a European scale .

5.7   Repercussions (External Efficiency)

Influence of the ECD-Project: The citizens presented their results at the European Parliament in Brussels. They were proud to have this opportunity, which also indicated to them that their judgments and opinions were taken up by the official policy makers. The representatives of the citizens, who summarised the results, were well prepared and presented their recommendations professionally. Most of the participants in the audience seemed to be content with the public presentation. Some citizens were disappointed or angry because there was no opportunity for an exchange of arguments or even a question-and-answer period during the event. Only the policy-makers commented the results presenting pre-formulated statements. Generally, the attendance of the media was low. Only a few journalists followed the presentation in the Parliament or in the press conference.

The ECD-Project is a methodological exploration into unknown space: it established an interaction among citizens, experts, and policy makers between the national and European level. This underpins the unique position of the ECD-Project in comparison to other initiatives. One surplus of the Meeting of Minds-Project lies in the experience and the insights gained by the innovative process, which proved that a comprehensive participative approach can be implemented across language and cultural barriers. However, the question remains

how this experience can be transformed into knowledge available for other projects and how it is possible to transfer these insights into other contexts.

The organizers of the King Baudouin Foundation and their partners intensively communicated the results and the experiences in dissemination workshops such as the seminar at the ESOF Conference in Munich. Publications like the "Methods Manual" summarized the experiences of the project in written form. The organizers and their partners presented the project, the experiences with the methods as well as the results to an interested audience from various social and educational backgrounds with exemplary engagement. At this point in time it is too early to search for any direct influence of the outcomes of the process into the official policy making bodies. Yet the organisers have invested time, effort and money to bring the results to those who need to implement them.

Despite the fact that only a few journalists attended the Conventions or the presentation in the European Parliament, the ECD-Project had an considerable **coverage in the media**. The evaluation team analysed media coverage in German and English newspapers. Around 10 articles were published from January 2006 to May 2006 by the specialised and the mainstream press.

The Meeting of Minds project was evaluated as an important and necessary endeavour. Most of the articles characterised the ECD-Project as useful and successful. A large majority of the articles described the citizens as well-informed, rational and unbiased. The methods were perceived as complex but nevertheless rated as proportional to the complexity of the subject.

The ECD-Project was considered as a remarkable and ambitious exercise with an immense value for democracy. Some articles expressed the fear that the method could serve as an instrument for orchestrating legitimacy rather than a process that could transform European decision making. The high financial costs of the ECD-Project were also mentioned. Some articles assessed the quality of the recommendations as astonishingly high, concrete and specific. Others, however,

labelled them as too vague and trivial. Beside one very critical evaluation, most articles were rather positive than negative about the exercise while some articles stroke a balance between positive and negative evaluations.

Nearly all the press-reports referred to the final event in the European Parliament. The selection of the location was effective in terms of media interest. Most articles did not present detailed information about the activities in the parliament - certainly due to the absence of journalists during the event. Some articles were published during the Second Convention. One could presume that the event of a Pan European Convention was perceived by the media as more attractive than the outcome. Almost all articles indicate the official Meeting-of-Minds-Website.

5.8 Communication and Organisation

The **Website** of the ECD-Project provides a lot of information for the interested visitor. The site informs about the methodological design, the underlying concept, the process time line, the objectives, etc.. The central publications of the project are offered for download such as the official reports, the basic information brochure and the book "Connecting Brains and Society". The site also includes newsletters of the project. More detailed information is available in the Extranet, which is only assessable by password. In sum, the ECD-Website met the needs for serving as a resource library to the public for all intents and purposes. An additional feature are the different video-interviews with scientists and experts who are related to brain science.

A web-log is present at the website, too. The collected comments of the citizens are assigned to the different process phases of the ECD-Project. The King Baudouin Foundation managed the entries into the

web-log. Some citizens repeatedly gave comments to the web-log. Our rough content analysis included all entries. The following section gives an overall impression of the citizens' assessments.

The comments assessing the ECD-Project were overwhelmingly positive. The contributors praised in particular the European level of the dialogue and encouraged further European thinking as a result of this project. Many participants of the process who gave their views characterised the process as a true learning experience which has transformed their own minds. The citizens also indicated that they learned a lot about the subject brain science. The intense relationship between citizens and experts was highly valued and appreciated. For a significant number of participants, the subject was not only an abstract topic to think about. They felt personally related to the subject in their own social surroundings. A number of citizens had been familiar with brain diseases, for instance in their families.

The participants had a high awareness of democracy. The contributors esteemed the ECD-Project as an important step to a continuous route for improved participation of the public in policy making. The Meeting-of-Minds-Process was described as hard work, but a number of citizens wanted to "anticipate the best". The process raised the hope of the citizens that the results would influence policy decisions. The citizens connected their hope with the expectation that the process did not end with the presentation of the final results. One statement requested, for instance, that the Meeting-of-Minds-Website will be kept updated. A continuous involvement of the citizens in the follow up phase was also demanded. Procedural aspects such as the time constraints were also mentioned among the negative aspects of the process. The citizens also missed the possibility for discussing brain science informally. One citizen criticised being uneasy with the fact that personal opinions were overshadowed by the majority.

The European Website of the ECD-Project offers no possibility for discussing brain sciences interactively. A few national websites like the site of UK provided a forum, but these facilities were not intensively used. The forum for the methodological discussion in the ex-

tranet at the European Website was closed because nobody participated.

One citizen of the UK Panel started a newsgroup at Yahoo. The 14 active members of this panel have used and still use this platform frequently since the group was founded in June 2005. The citizens reported their experiences regarding meetings and exchanged articles or internet-links concerning brain sciences. Photos from the ECD-Events were also posted.

These activities, as well as the existence of the newsgroup, illustrate that many citizens welcome the opportunity for a continuous exchange. Statements within the Yahoo-Newsgroup answer the question of why the Yahoo-Forum has been established instead of participating in the Meeting of Minds-Forum at the UK-Website. The Yahoo newsgroup is seen as more user-friendly and less formal than the official website. The members of the newsgroup can easily send mails, which are posted to all group members.

A forum or a newsgroup is easy to install and the resources needed for such a website is comparatively low. Not only the participants of UK wanted the opportunity of an additional dialogue outside und beyond the ECD-Process. An open newsgroup or forum at the European Website would give the possibility of posting comments to all interested participants as well as to external actors. This could stimulate more impact and lead to more sustainable long-time-effects of the ECD-Project. This possibility was not seized.

The forum at the UK-Website illustrates that the ECD-Project tried to invite people to contribute to an online dialog. This possibility was not well enough communicated. The European Website should provide an easy and salient assess to the discussion-forum. One banner or salient link at the main-website and more "public relations" during the Conventions would have increased the chances to get an active forum.

The Yahoo-Newsgroup is an example of the ECD-Project having indirect outcomes. These outcomes are not easy to detect but they are

remarkable. The existence of this newsgroup illustrates the commitment and the competence of the citizens. They founded their own network of interaction and communication. These competences do exist and they could also be used in the project, which underlies the deep involvement of all participants.

5.9   Overall Efficiency and Effectiveness

Was the whole exercise worth while undertaking? Were the participants overstressed by the demanding tasks? Had the dialogue started with subject too broad for citizens to digest in limited time? These questions were raised many times during the process by observers and organisers. The answer to these questions is rather clear. All participants who had voiced their opinion in the survey or on the internet affirmed the impression that the project served their needs. The project was regarded as innovative and significant for European policy making and as rewarding for all who had the opportunity to participate. A lot of citizens and many other interview partners also appreciated the choice of the subject. None of the interviewed citizens felt overtaxed or had the impression the subject was too difficult for them to digest. Brain science was seen as an unexplored subject in the sciences as well as in society. The citizens welcomed the opportunity to start a discussion open minded leaving enough room for further exploration and prioritisation. The information given by the organisers served the process of making all participants familiar with the topic. An explicit pre-selection of aspects would have limited the possibilities of the citizens to develop their own perspective on brain science.

The **logistical organisation** by the King Baudouin Foundation and the other organisers was excellent. In view of the number of actors

and the complexity of the entire undertaking, the organisational process emerged smoothly and effectively. The dialogues were well prepared and structured due to the efforts of the support team and the staff of the King Baudouin Foundation. The high commitment of the citizens can be seen as a reaction to these extensive efforts. The well selected location of the Conventions and for the presentation of the results offered a supportive symbolic emphasis to the significance of the entire exercise. A vast majority of the citizens confirmed this impression of a well organised and managed process in the survey of the internal evaluation.

A process such a the ECD-Project needs adequate **financial resources** and it is important that these resources are available. Some critical voices mentioned that it would be less expensive to develop a citizens' statement based on internet discussion rather than face-to-face interaction. Without any doubt internet participatory exercises are easier to organise and do not need the amount of resources compared to conventional meetings. However, only face-to-face meetings provide opportunities for direct interaction and communication among the participants. The subject can be explored, prioritised and evaluated in direct exchange of arguments. If an elaborated European statement to brain science is the objective of the process, we are convinced that this can be delivered only by a face-to-face meeting. One could, however, think of combining internet deliberations with shorter direct meetings in which the participants meet face-to-face. In addition, only a personal meeting can produce something like a European group identity. An internet meeting or meetings only at national level would not contribute to the European dimension.

The panel-design served the intended objectives and was efficient. The citizens needed time for exploration and for evaluation of the available information in order to develop their statement. The iterative phases of reflection and elaboration proved to be well suited for dealing with a complex issue such as brain sciences.

A challenging but also encouraging aspect is the fact that brain sciences and related technologies are still in development. This process

proves that participatory technology assessment is not necessarily occurring after the facts but can provide anticipatory advise to developers, users and regulators before the impacts on human health, human identity and social well-being are fully known. This is exactly the point in time where technologies can still be shaped or modified. Technologies that build upon brain science are not yet culturally interpreted and embedded in daily life, which opens the opportunity to develop a broad socially accepted conception of these new technologies. This goal can be accomplished by means of participatory technology assessment, which implies the incorporation of all relevant actors including the ordinary citizens. The alternative route of pressing new technologies in the market will likely fail if citizens and consumers believe that their essential concerns have not been taken into account. The conventional approach of "develop, market and defend" is not going to succeed under these circumstances and it will imply more expenses of money and time, because developers will face the problem of lacking acceptance when it is too late. The success of the ECD-Project in form of a joint agreement as laid out in the reports document the feasibility and efficiency of public participation even at European level. All experiences gained in the process of the Meeting of Minds - Project constitute a valuable base for advancing participatory technology assessment on the European level.

6   Summary

The Project Meeting of Minds accomplished all envisioned objectives – the content related objectives with great success, the procedural objectives with satisfactory success. The citizens' elaboration phase resulted in the European Citizens' Assessment Report and the National Synthesis Report. The two reports represent concrete policy advice and are important indicators for the feasibility of a successful dialog among European citizens.

The ECD-Project provided a lot of experiences of how to constitute and implement a successful methodology for a participative process. In a comparison with other initiatives at the European level, the Meeting of Minds-Project occupied a unique position. One essential and unique design feature has been the interaction between the national and the European level of dialog during the process. The participants in the European dialog interacted in a multi-lingual and multi-cultural context across national boarders. The process involved experts as resource persons but the citizens played the central role because they generated the final outcomes.

The interaction between scientists and the citizens generally was trustful and effective. Both sides were interested in the perspective of the counterpart. The lively exchange and the mutual interest on each other's perspective can be seen as an important outcome of the project.

Being designed as an exploratory exercise for a European dialog among citizens the project triggered the motivation to show best performance by all participants. The commitment of all persons involved, especially the commitment of the citizens, was very high.

The citizens acted not only as representatives of their country, they understood themselves as European participants. The process promoted a European dialog and, as a consequence of this, an emerging

European group identity among the citizens. The project successfully connected the individuals with the process and its objectives. It can be assumed that this "Meeting of Minds-Identity" was one of the triggers for the high degree of commitment. The visible, intense efforts of the organizers additionally fostered the commitment of the citizens. The citizens proved to be reliable and competent. They were fully capable to contribute to the process and the complex subject matter and they took full responsibility for the results.

The basic design of the process generally worked as intended. The order of events was logically structured and served the envisioned process. Some aspects of the basic designs were not optimally implemented, which lead to negative impacts on the process and occasionally reduced the personal involvement and dedication. The design of the European events placed more attention on structural components such as rule setting. Less efforts were invested in facilitating the interactions among all persons involved as well as in procedural aspects. However, these aspects did not compromise the quality of the recommendations.

There were three concrete problems connected with the two Citizens' Conventions: the time framing, the lack of transparency of the procedures and the dense regulation of the dialog by rules ("over-proceduralisation").

- One major constraint during the Convention was the time pressure. The long working days physically challenged all participants, diminished opportunities to participate freely in the dialog and led to activities of diversion. The narrow time frame additionally reduced the possibilities to compensate difficult situations and intensified or caused some problems.

- A lack of transparency was detected regarding the procedures and methods but also concerning the content and the visualisation of content. The overload of the process especially aggravated the dialog.

- The interactions were strongly influenced by a vast number of regulations and rules that increased the complexity of the process, caused a high "cognition load" and produced irritations of all persons involved as well as irregularities in the process. Some rules also turned out to be counterproductive.

The organisers invested large efforts to communicate their experiences as well as the results of the dialog to the science community, the political institutions and interested actors in society. They selected an adequate framing for the transmission of the results to the political decision makers in the European Parliament. This event also triggered important repercussions in the media.

It still remains open whether the project can produce long-term impacts. The communication and dissemination phase is not yet completed. The citizens as well as other persons involved articulated their hope that the project will have an effect on the policy level. Political impact also depends on factors that are outside of the control of the participants as well as the organisers. However, there were opportunities for the organisers that were not fully seized. For example, the establishment of an informal online-dialog located on the project's web-site would have increased the possibility of a long-term impact.

Brain sciences and related technologies are still in the phase of early development. Their implications raise fundamental questions of human identity and the nature of the human mind, issues that have not been adequately addressed in the scientific communities dealing with this subject. Without public involvement and participation the public is likely to reject the concepts and interpretations put forth by technical elites. Since these questions transcend scientific or technical aspects of feasibility and implementability it is essential that a broad discourse about the ethical and social implications is initiated and sustained.

The Meeting of Minds-Project can be seen as a valuable contribution for developing a broad socially accepted perspective on these new technologies. The project provided ordinary citizens with the opportunity to raise an "official" voice and offer an informed set of prefer-

ences and recommendations addressed to decision makers. The project promoted an elevated level of public understanding of science as well as a better "scientific understanding of the public".

The Meeting of Minds-Project documents the feasibility, the effectiveness and the efficiency of public participation even at a multinational European level. All methodological experiences gained during the process constitute a valuable base for developing and advancing participatory technology assessment on the European level.

References

Meeting of Minds Partner Consortium (2006): European Citizens' Assessment Report. Complete Results. Brussels: ISBN-13-978-90-5130-540-1

Habermas, Jürgen (1992): Faktizität und Geltung. Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des modernen Rechtsstaates. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp

Renn, Ortwin (2004): "The Challenge of Integrating Deliberation and Expertise: Participation and Discourse in Risk Management", in: McDaniels, Timothy and Small; Michael S. (eds.): Risk Analysis and Society. An Interdisciplinary Characterization of the Field. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, pp. 289-366

Webler, Thomas (1995): "Right" Discourse in Citizen Participation. An Evaluative Yardstick., in: Renn, Ortwin und Webler, Thomas und Wiedemann, Peter (eds.): Fairness and Competence in Citizens Participation. Evaluating New Models for Environmental Discourse. Dordrecht und Boston: Kluwer, pp. 35-86

Annex A

Interim Report of the External Evaluation of
Meeting of Minds –
European Citizens' Deliberation on
Brain Sciences 2005

Stuttgart, December 8, 2005

Contents

1   Description of the External Evaluation Process

1.1   Major Objectives of the External Evaluation

The major objective of the external evaluation is to review the methodological concept and design of the ECD-Project. Thus the main research question is of, how the dialogue processes have been initiated and how they will be sustained over the course of the whole project. Of central importance is the ultimate goal of the exercise, i.e. the development leading to a common statement of European citizens to brain science. The stages towards this goal are accompanied by external evaluation including process-related and organizational issues.

Participatory processes in general and this approach in particular can be characterized by two major components:

1. Inclusion: This refers to issues such as the composition of the Stakeholders, the selection of subjects and issues, the time-frame and other aspects of what could be included in the process.

2. Closure: This refers to issues such as the quality of procedures to reach final conclusions, the climate of discourse (fairness, constructiveness), possibilities to raise and test arguments, the management of consensus and disagreement.

1.2   Main Proceeding of the External Evaluation

To give an overview of the main evaluation procedure the following section summarizes the most important activities and methods. The detailed proceeding is described together with the corresponding results later in form of report modules. The evaluation started with some **initial activities**:

1. The evaluation team started a comparison of the ECD-Project with similar initiatives at European level, for example, the evaluation of the nanotechnology program by the IRGC or the Public Participating Project of the European Expert Group on Bio-technology. This comparison will be done for illustrative purposes. The target is not a systematic review.

2. To get a better feeling for the overall goals and perspectives of the ECD-Project, the evaluation team conducted interviews with members of the European project management. The main target was to explore the major intentions, objectives and expectations of the organizers.

The **core activity** of the evaluation consists of two methods and focuses on the processes at the European level.

1. The team members observe the communications and interactions during crucial meetings on the European level like the Citizens Conventions and the Stakeholder Meetings. A pre-structured observation tool has been and will be used for coding the necessary data. Some background dimensions of the measurement are:

    a. Process of discussion / of creating the results

    b. Distribution of agreement vs. conflict

    c. Management of consensus and disagreement

2. In addition to the evaluation, team members have started to interview key persons of the major events. If a face-to-face interview is not possible during one of the observed events, the team members try to arrange a interview by telephone.

The main events are scheduled in a time interval from May 2005 to June 2006. It is advisable to keep the evaluation plan flexible that one can adequately react to changes, new experiences and occurrences in the course of the ECD project. Most attention is given to the following events:

1. First Citizens' Convention (Jun. 2005)   Observation and Interviews

2. First Stakeholder Workshop (Jun. 2005)   Observation

3. Second Citizens' Convention (Jan. 2006)   Observation and Interviews

4. Stakeholder Workshop 2006 (Jan. 2006)   Observation

5. Policy Advice workshop for

    European Key-Stakeholders (Jun 2006)   Observation

The main research and evaluation activities are enhanced by several **accompanying measures**:

1. One target is to scan the website of Meeting of Minds (www.meetingmindseurope.org). This will provide more insights about the expectations, intentions and the assessments of key players of the process. The analysis will be directed towards the commentaries concerning the ECD-Project, especially towards the conventions.

2. A second target is the integration of the internal and external evaluation without violating the independence of each of the two approaches. A suitable method to reach both objectives, integration and independence of results, is to conduct an interview with Alison Moore. The insights gained from this interview also assist the evaluation team to link the results of the European level with those from each national experience.

The analysis is based on a multi-method design which allows direct comparison between the results of several methods. Results of one method can be validated and triangulated by data of the other methods. There is also the possibility to explain one result of method A by another result of method B.

2   Introduction - Initial Activities

2.1   Initial Comparison of the ECD-Project with Other Projects at European Level

In order to have a basis for comparison and benchmarking the team of DIALOGIK has agreed to compare the concept and design of the European Citizens' Deliberation project with similar initiatives at European level and national science and society programs. This comparison will be done for illustrative purposes and cannot be regarded as a systematic comparative review. As different official bodies of the U.S. Government are showing initiatives in greater public involvement in science and technology policy, we have widened this comparison with one example of the long running National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

Some short additional information on the idea of Participatory Technology Assessment (PTA) and its history should be given first (see also: Renn / Webler / Wiedemann 1995, Rowe / Frewer 2000, Nentwich 2000).

As decision and policy makers engage in solving different issues concerning, for example, the management of environmental problems an increased interest in involving the public can be recognized since a few decades. On behalf of the U.S. Congress, in the 1970's a political instrument called Technology Assessment (TA) was developed in order to give its members access to objective, independent and competent information on scientific and technological issues. This enabled members of congress to be in a better position to value legislative projects and further on to base their political ability to act on

more feasible alternatives. Particularly in Europe, the concept of PTA evolved over the years; less addressed to the legislators but to the executive branch and other levels of government. While the U.S. model was based on a clear distinction between the scientific approach and a societal evaluation, involving Stakeholders only after the analysis, the European way of assessment has been attempting to integrate scientific assessments and plural value input in a single step. A "participatory turn", mainly originated in Denmark (Nentwich 2000), reinforced the political dimension of TA so that the activities on an academic level and its outcome were opened and communicated to and with a broader public.

Involvement of the public in scientific and technological issues can be achieved in different ways and at different levels: from informing the public about an issue to an active sharing of power and decision making. The classic "ladder of Participation" designed by Arnstein (1969) provides a model of gradual increase of citizens influence on the decision making level. At the highest level, citizens are viewed as an integral part of the governance process and their active involvement is considered essential in the substantive decisions about assessment results and what they mean (Roberts 2004). To solicit public views actively through mechanisms such as citizens juries, citizens panels, planning cells, consensus conferences, deliberative polling, questionnaires etc. (see for further detail Abelson/Forest/Eyles et al 2003, download in August 2005 under: www.vcn.bc.ca/citizens-handbook/compareparticipation .pdf) represents the medium involvement level of Arnstein's ladder. Selecting members of the public to provide them with some degree of decision- and policy-making authority can be seen as an example for the highest level of incorporating the public in shared decision making.

 In the next paragraphs we are going to give an overview on the methods and design of the ECD-Project with the purpose of comparing this project with 9 different approaches in PTA.

These are:

- Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters; signed by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Economic Commission for Europe on 25 June 1998 (today 40 signatories and 37 parties)

- ADAPTA: Assessing Public Debate and Participation in Technology Assessment in Europe, 1998 – 2000

- CIPAST: Citizen Participation in Science and Technology

- ESRC Sustainable Technologies Programme: Nanotechnology, Risk and Sustainability -Moving Public Engagement Upstream, 2004 – 2006

- EUROPTA: European Participatory Technology Assessment, since 1998

- IFOK: Governance of the European Research Area – The Role of Civil Society, 2003

- IRGC: International Risk Governance Council, Nanotechnology

- NEPA: United States National Environmental Policy Act, since 1972

- PATH: Participatory Approaches in Science and Technology

To enhance readability the following section lists the programmes in form of tables. The descriptions were directly taken out of the official documentations. The sources will be given in brackets. The summarized overviews include the dimensions:

a) subject of the programme and its attendants,

b) intensions and objectives,

c) target groups,

d) central technique,

e) methodology and concept of incorporation and

f) outcome of the programme.

Table 1: Meeting of Minds - ECD

Meeting of Minds – European Citizens' Deliberation on Brain Science (Download in November 2005 under: http://www.meetingmindseurope.org/	
Subject / Attendants	A Citizens' debate on ethical, legal and social issues in the case of brain science with relevant experts, Stakeholders and policy-maker at national, international and European level. To conduct three national and two European meetings with altogether 126 European Citizens from nine countries. The ECD-Project itself was convened by the Meeting of Minds initiative, a two-year pilot project led by a partner consortium of technology assessment bodies, science museums, academic institutions and public foundations representing nine European countries. This initiative was coordinated and co-funded by the King Baudouin Foundation. The European Commission supported the launch of the project in 2004.

Objectives and intensions	The implementation of a new way of interactive governance at European cross-national level via citizen participation in assessing of and deliberate on a scientific issue and by that to provide relevant input into a wider public debate on the particular field.
	The methodology used allows to identify differences as well as commonalities between citizens from different nations and cultural contexts in regard to their attitudes and values towards current and new developments in brain science as well as assessment and expectations of societal and ethical aspects in this topic.
	Overall the concept is aimed to consider and assess socially relevant issues in science and technology by actively involving experts, citizens, civil society actors and policy-makers. Doing so the concept intends to provide relevant analyses of scientific-technological issues in their socio-political contexts now and in future, to offer advice to policy- and decision-makers, to enhance social learning among experts, Stakeholders and citizens and to stimulate and inform public debate. Furthermore the aspect of deliberation emphasizes pro-activity in contributing to public policy.
Target groups	Ordinary citizens, Stakeholders, scientists, experts and policy- and decision-makers at national, international and European level.
Central technique	Results are made by the citizens, escorting Stakeholders and experts, facilitating and coordinating consortium of different organisations.
Methodology and concept of incorporation	Citizens panels via national panels and European conventions: deliberative method, Table Design. On the basis of a common information brochure, containing an introduction to brain science with six case studies, citizen panellists from nine countries were randomly selected to receive invitations to participate in the project. Among the citizens

Methodology and concept of incorporation	willing to participate, the selection of the final panellist group is ought to represent the diversity of the society in each country. In the middle of 2005, the selected citizens were invited to initial introductory meetings in each of the participating countries, escorted by national project Coordinators and national Facilitators. At the end of this process, the citizens formulated up to five themes for each of the six case studies they wanted to discuss further. Notes on additionally needed information requested further input of experts. At the first meeting of the European Citizens' panel at the First Convention on 3 – 5 June 2005 in Brussels, most of the time was spent deliberating in small groups of 8 to 10 participants from various countries. Each table's discussion periods were assisted by a Facilitator, a Rapporteur and a simultaneous and consecutive language Interpreter. The table's ideas and recommendations, captured by the Rapporteur, were submitted to a central desk called Theme Team that consolidated the output and reported back the primary results and ideas to panellists and the plenary. The procedure was supported by additional polling through keypad devices in order to gather demographic information, to evaluate the process throughout the Convention and to give the citizens the opportunity to express and share their considerations. At the end of the First Convention a common set of questions for further deliberation back at national level was established. Between October and November 2005, national meetings take place with the purpose of continuing and expanding the process of deliberation. For that, the panellist are enabled to raise questions with experts and policy-makers they invite, to document these shared opinion of the panels and to submit these papers to the second and final European Convention at the end of January 2006.

Outcome	With the Second European Convention, observations, opinion, recommendations and proposals should be presented to interested Stakeholders, experts, policy-makers, the media and the general public in Europe. An European assessment report will be handed over to high-level European officials and representatives of the European scientific and research community at a public ceremony

Table 2: ADAPTA

ADAPTA: Assessing Public Debate and Participation in Technology Assessment in Europe (Download in September 2005 under: http://www.inra.fr/Internet/Directions/SED/science-gouvernance/pub/ADAPTA/)	
Subject / Attendants	Analysis of the interaction between public debate, policy process and forms of public participations (formal and informal) in science and technology by a European research network. As the project has to be seen as a comparison of the forms and existence of dialogue arrangements, the interactions between PTA, public debates and policy processes in each of the six European countries (Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Portugal and the United Kingdom), lay people, experts / academics and governmental officials participated in the exercises in a different range. The final "Users' Conference" in Brussels on October 9th and 10th, 2000 attracted beside the ADAPTA partners from different academic institutions and foundations 28 national experts and decision makers as well as members of the European Commission.
Objectives and intensions	Thematically, the public debate in six European countries on three issues were analysed: urban transport, genetically modified organisms in food and agriculture, genetic testing. To access these

Objectives and intensions	interactions, in total 17 case studies have been carried out. It was intended to analyse technology assessment (TA) approaches in which lay people or interest groups have been participating as well as other forms of social discussions in which the same groups have participated but are outside an official TA exercise. The ADAPTA project focuses on the identification of the conditions under which specific forms of participatory TA occur in the public debate, on the assessment of the impacts of public debate on biotechnology and the policy process in selected European countries as well as on the analysis of social and organisational innovations induced by the development of specific forms of public debate and PTA.
Target groups	Actors from civil society, the economy and the political arena, experts and academics, NGOs, churches, decision-makers at national, international and European level.
Central technique	Deliberative method: Proposing the Arena concept for public debate, for example bioethical commissions, ethical advisory boards, workshops, consensus conferences, discourse meetings, citizens' juries, and expert discussions, which the media also reports on for the general public. The forums and "trans-arenas" were organised by policy-makers, scientists, medical doctors or representatives of patients' and women's associations. In four countries out of six, the forums were structured around lay citizens which play a central role in the assessment process.
Methodology and concept of incorporation	Based on an intensive literature overview 17 case studies on specific PTA activities in three technology fields (urban transport policy, genetically modified food, genetic and predictive testing) have been carried out. Besides written material around 10-15 semi-structured interviews per case study have been conducted with participants, involved

Methodology and concept of incorporation	experts, organisers and other relevant persons for this purpose. The topics of the interviews related to the public debate or the PTA itself, the period preceding the PTA and the time after the PTA. Since the same procedure was followed in the other five participating countries, it was possible to conclude and compare the findings of the different case studies in a transversal analysis. Three of the formal dialogue events (Denmark, France and UK) can be considered as participatory technology assessment exercises. They involve lay people and deal with public opinion: they aim at better assessing public opinion in this controversial area (what are the key issues at stake? What are the main conflicts? …). The expected benefits of this formula relies on the possibility to involve an informed public in a deliberative process. Lay people who have not vested interests are selected precisely because they only represent nothing but themselves. Also, they do not have any expert knowledge. That's why the PTA exercise includes a phase of training where panel members receive basic information on the subject which aims at showing the state of the art, the state of the unknown and the areas of controversies. With such a training, lay citizens are supposed to represent an informed public, independent from specific vested interests.
Outcome	According to the different findings on the interaction between public debate and policy making in regard to PTA as a part of an overall effort towards wider public participation it is said, that more research work is needed to understand: at European level, why and how public participation can become a real and structural process of European policy making (especially for science and technology policies),

Outcome	• if the new discourses on governance are in condition to provide answers to public claim for democratic and accountable European policy making and at the same time for taking into national socio-polical cultures and systems. At national level, • why and how public participation can become also in Southern European countries a strong dimension of the policy making, • how the coupling between public participation and policy processes can be strengthened.

Table 3: Aarhus Convention

Aarhus Convention (Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters) (Download in November 2005 under: http://www.unece.org/env/pp/wgp.htm)	
Subject / Attendants	Access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters. Five meetings of working groups of the parties on following matters of subject: • Pollutant release and transfer registers; • Genetically modified organisms; • Access to justice; • Electronic information tools; • Capacity-building activities and clearing-house mechanism; • Compliance mechanism; • Reporting requirements; • Public participation in strategic decision-making;

Subject / Attendants	• Public participation in international forums. Attendants: Signatories of the convention (30 states attended the meetings so far), observers of other governments that are members of the UN, regional economic organisations, intergovernmental organisations and its specialised agencies as observers, NGOs (75 representatives of that 50 are members of international and national environmental citizens' organisations, ECOs) from the UNECE region, observing Members of the public according to rule 7 of the Aarhus Convention (50 seats) and the media.
Objectives and intensions	The Aarhus Convention provides the framework for good practice by providing the basic procedure for public participation and specifying the types of decisions to which it should apply. The spirit of the convention is to involve the public wherever possible. For instance, the emergency services, which must act immediately without public participation, could involve the public in the preparation of their general plans. The decision-making process should be open to everyone so that anyone affected by the decision can participate. The best decision-making processes actively seek out all the people and organisations likely to be affected by the decision so that they are fully aware of it and its likely effect on them. A wide range of interests should be identified and encouraged to take part in the process. An overall objective is to enhance the quality and the implementation of decisions in the field of the environment. To improve access to information and public participation in decision-making. To contribute to public awareness of environmental issues and to give the public the opportunity to express its concerns and to enable public authorities to take due account of such concerns. Additionally to further the accountability of and

Objectives and inten-sions	transparency in decision-making and to strengthen public support for decisions on the environment. The main purpose of public participation exercise will be to make sure the public's opinions are taken into account in the final plan or programme. The key aims will be to: • inform the public that the plan/programme is being prepared; • help them form considered opinions on the relevant issues; • collect their opinions and ideas; and • prepare a plan/programme that takes account of their opinions.
Target groups	Government at national, regional and other level; Natural or legal persons performing public administrative functions under national law, including specific duties, activities or services in relation to the environment; Any other natural or legal persons having public responsibilities or functions, or providing public services, in relation to the environment; Independent academics; NGOs (ECOs), Associations and Organisations, the public.
Central technique	Top-down approach. Members of the public are allowed to participate as observers; framing by governing bodies, main input from academics and experts
Methodology and concept of incorporation	• Focus Groups (small representative groups of the public) • Exhibitions in public places (markets, sports centre) • Public meetings • Media involvement to raise awareness • An information office with trained staff to explain proposals to the public • Education programmes on environmental issues to help the public form an opinion • Visits to similar sites or installations

Methodology and concept of incorporation	• Leaflets to distribute in public places
	• Sending out summary documents in simple language
	• Participating in local events such as carnivals and parties by having an exhibition
	• Using community groups
	• One to one meetings
	• Send a questionnaire to interest groups
	• Going to local places (e.g. tea houses)
	• "Brainstorming" sessions with the public (ideas are shouted out one by one and analysed more slowly afterwards)
	• Prepare brochures with questions in the back that the public can send by post to the authority
	• Write up case studies in newsletters to encourage best practice
	• Use independent experts to offer advice to the public so that they can form an opinion
	• Use people trained in public participation
	• Internet websites to provide information and techniques allow comments to be made
	• Special theme days (e.g. ozone day) to raise awareness
	• Hold a slide show with questions and answers afterwards
	• Open Parliamentary meetings to generate trust
	• Use games to encourage public participation
	• Introductory talks about the proposal
	• Use workshops to get opinions
	• Competitions with prizes to raise interest
	• Use local people to get the public's opinions (e.g. think of a name the for the strategy) to overcome a lack of trust in the authority

Methodology and concept of incorporation	Using representative groups (focus groups: non-deliberative method)Where the public's opinions are needed at several stages of a long process, it may be better to use a representative group of the public concerned. If the public is asked to comment too often they may stop responding. Using a representative group reduces the number of times the general public needs to be asked to comment on a proposal. Representative groups can also develop a better understanding of the proposal, as they will have been involved in every stage. In the Hampshire waste strategy example (Darren Mepham), a representative group was created to collect opinions on various stages of the process. The group members were selected by: • a community appraisal (6 months) to find out what the group should reflect; • identifying the key groups from the appraisal; and • sampling specific people by questionnaire (2-3 months) to see if they would make good group members. Using a representative group for some stage of the process does not mean that authorities can avoid consulting all of the public concerned at key stages in the process. Involvement and publicity 1.) It is good practice to involve all of the local organisations affected as well as individual members of the public. The Durham case study provides a good example of the range of groups that can be involved. In this case, it included: – schools; – local authorities and statutory bodies; – community groups; – residents' organisations;– business and industry; – women's organisations; and – NGOs and voluntary agencies.

Methodology and concept of incorporation	2.) It is good practice for authorities to actively encourage the public to participate. Many of the case studies use publicity campaigns to do this. For example, in the Croydon case study the authority used a range of methods: - writing to hundreds of local organisations offering workshops; – holding public meetings with videos; – publishing information in local newspapers; – sending information to local schools; and – putting on public exhibitions in libraries and at local events.
Outcome	Several parties (24 of 30 States that were parties) submitted national implementation reports to the secretariat of UNECE. A majority of the Parties that submitted national implementation reports appear to have used transparent and participatory processes to prepare and discuss the reports. Methods used included involving NGOs, an Aarhus Convention working group and an Aarhus national team in the process (Azerbaijan); disseminating drafts of the reports to NGOs (e.g. Georgia); making them publicly available for comment on the web sites of the Ministries of the Environment (MoEs) (Armenia, Bulgaria, Finland, France, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); and holding public hearings (Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan) and consultations with NGOs (Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Republic of Moldova, Tajikistan). Some countries had national reports discussed with NGOs and public authorities in both cities and regions (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine). Kazakhstan reported on having prepared a specific memorandum regarding the integration of public comments in the preparation of its implementation report. In certain countries, materials and gap analysis prepared through technical assistance projects on the

Outcome	implementation of the Convention were used (Belarus, Kazakhstan, Ukraine). While most parties indicated that the results of consultations with the public had been taken into account, they generally did not indicate whether differences of opinion had emerged from consultation processes and how such differences, if any, had been reflected in the reports. Some countries, such as Finland, did recognize that in cases where there was a difference of opinion, the official government position had been used as the basis for the answers in the report.

Table 4: CIPAST

CIPAST: Citizens Participation in Science and Technology (Download in November 2005 under: http://www.wilabonn.de/cipast/cipast.php)	
Subject / Attendants	The CIPAST-Project aims at bringing together different families of experienced actors from organisations with significant experiences in the use of participatory procedures in scientific and technological issues. Twelve organisations from seven countries co-operate in this three year project to achieve and encourage improved knowledge and experience transfer between European actors and decision-makers involved in participatory initiatives by structuring a network, disseminating good practices and circulating relevant information.
Objectives and intensions	The CIPAST work programme will foster the transfer of expertise through the implementation of training programmes for the three identified contexts of decision: "upstream", "regulation" and "social diffusion". A corpus of training tools, based on case-studies and tested in training sessions, will be developed for the pragmatic needs of the potential users.

Objectives and intensions	**Programme 1** – Upstream
	Research policy-making is a field, in which participatory procedures already exist and are likely to spread in the coming years. This trend brings the involvement of civil society 'upstream', what means closer to the early phases of scientific developments and technological trajectories. This is especially the case for government ministries in charge of the definition of research priorities and public research bodies, which may consult concerned groups at the planning or experimental stage of research decision-making.
	Programme 2 – Regulations
	In the field of institutional technology assessment, parliamentary offices have to date been the main actors. However, the relationship to participatory procedures differs significantly from one institution (and country) to the other.
	Programme 3 - Social Diffusion.
	In the so-called public understanding of science several actors have carried out participatory initiatives. Their legitimacy stems from the role they play as public institutions engaged in the dissemination of scientific culture, and from the strong audiences they have among the wider public. Not only capable of stimulating public debate, but also capable of making the necessary knowledge to improve the overall quality of the debate publicly accessible, they will also be able to develop specific expertise and competence in this field. They constitute the main structured and formal way of civil society involvement in scientific and technological issues.
	All of the specific training programmes are targeting decision makers - including both (potential) organisers as well as (potential) users of participatory procedures - at the level of regulation procedures, when the decision aims to frame the uses through laws, rules and standards.

Objectives and intensions	The training programmes are including a planning workshop, with the involvement of members of the CIPAST Platform and others practitioners with experience of designing and using participatory methods & procedures and a training workshop, led by experienced members of the CIPAST Platform. All of the workshops provide training, guidance and advice to organisations and individuals wishing to deploy participatory methods & procedures.
Target groups	Various present / potential actors from the civil society as associations, NGOs and lay people. Within these two categories of current or potential partners the actors to be involved include: • technology assessment institutions and agencies • science museums, science centres and science shops • research organisations, public or private • civil society actors affected by and engaged in science and technology, such as NGO's or patient associations, universities, academic and management schools engaged in the socio-political analysis and evaluation of participatory processes.
Central technique	Deliberative Methods: Consensus Conferences, Scenario Workshops and Citizens Juries Regarding the consensus conference: A consensus conference is a chaired public hearing with an audience from the public and with active participation of 10-15 laypersons (sometimes called the jury or the panel) and a corresponding number of different experts. The experts may be from different disciplines and/or from different schools within a discipline.
Incorporation Concept	With the principal instruments of its networking activity such as workshops, training sessions, discussions lists, newsletter and website, CIPAST will give priority to involve the various actors coming from the civil society. To expand the circle

Incorporation Concept	of societal participants, CIPAST training pro-grammes and CIPAST networking action will be systematically targeted to the involvement of asso-ciations and NGOs as well as lay citizens. The methodological principle of CIPAST work programme implies that the implementation of these objectives will be strongly interactive. The implementation of training programmes and the realisation of training material will be carried out through two stages, each of them will contribute to enhance the networking process and to foster a "community-building". The first stage will be a phase of structured preparation, when workshops which will gather +/- 40 experienced actors. The second stage will be a phase of training, opened to +/- 100 users or candidate users of participatory methods. The networking and dissemination activities will facilitate the preparation, the organisation and the dissemination of the outcomes of the training programmes, and will improve and enlarge the access for newcomers to relevant knowledge, in-formation and expertise.
Outcome	CIPAST work programme is scheduled to last three years. The Cité des sciences et de l'industrie (Paris) will be in charge with the scientific co-ordination. The CIPAST steering committee will hold at least five meetings, in order to examine, discuss and approve the reports presented by each work-package. Networking is a permanent activity of the whole consortium, but will be co-ordinated by Imedia, Université de Lausanne. The discussion lists, web-site and bi-monthly newsletter (http://www.wilabonn.de/cipast/ download/CIPAST% 20Newsletter%201.pdf) will be launched during the first year of the pro-ject, and will be maintained up to the end, under co-ordination of the Bonn Science Shop. The

Outcome	possible participation to a common public conference, with other European programmes involved in participatory processes will be discussed during year 3 of the project (2007). The planning workshops will take place in October 2006. The conception, as well as preparation and production of training material will be opened to +/- 40 organisations, who do not belong to CIPAST consortium, but have a significant experience of participatory initiatives; The training workshops will take place in October 2007 and will be opened to 60 new partners or potential users. As outcome of this process, training material will be made available for larger use, on DVD support and on-line.

Table 5: ESRC

ESRC Sustainable Technologies Programme Nanotechnology, Risk and Sustainability: Moving Public Engagement Upstream (Download in October 2005 under: http://www.sustainabletechnologies.ac.uk/)	
Subject / Attendants	The aim of the project is to improve the contribution of nanotechnology to sustainable development by developing socially and environmentally-sensitive governance processes which move the site of public engagement upstream – closer to the heart of R&D processes. (January 2004 – February 2006) Several seminars were attended by academics / experts, governmental officials and different NGOs (Greenpeace UK, GeneWatch…)

Objectives and intensions	The particular objectives are:
	- To draw lessons from recent experiences with biotechnology that can be applied to emerging debates about the sustainability of nanotechnology; - To examine expert and public perceptions of the social, cultural and environmental implications of nanotechnology; - To develop novel methodologies for interaction between experts and the public which can better integrate public responses into innovation processes; - To improve processes of dialogue between nanoscientists, policy-makers and the general public, and to contribute to the development of a socially and environmentally-sensitive regulatory framework for nanotechnology. The project aims to clarify the above objectives through a five-stage programme, as follows: Phase 1. Learning from past experience Phase 2. Lifeworld research Phase 3. Exploring public responses Phase 4. Expert interaction with the public Phase 5. Dissemination and writing-up
Target groups	Nanoscientists, policy-makers and the general public
Central technique	Non-deliberative by the use of focus groups. ESRC is conducting 12 focus groups sessions, an expert / public workshop, an interactive workshop consisting of 10-15 members of the focus groups, and 10-15 nanoscientists.

Methodology and concept of incorporation	A substantial activity undertaken by the research team was to develop a proposal for an ESRC Centre on Nanotechnologies and Society (CENTSOC). The proposal developed from the current ESRC grant and led to an innovative proposed programme of research involving NanoCentre bid. Although the proposal was successful at 5 stages of peer review and was recommended for funding by the ESRC Strategic Research Board, it was turned down by ESRC Council. The process of developing the proposal took a considerable amount of time and energy and caused some delay on the original schedule (although plans are now in place for the project and its deliverables to be delivered on time). However, the process of undertaking the proposal consolidated relationships and has given the project considerable profile. This has included the consolidation of relationships within Lancaster University (including the scientists and the University management), with the wider policy community (including key government departments and agencies), and with the research councils (in particular with the EPSRC). Plans are being developed to cement such relationships through a range of planned new initiatives and activities.
Outcome	• The project team gave evidence to the Royal Society/ RAE inquiry into nanotechnology, and our call for 'upstream' public dialogue featured prominently in the Royal Society's final report; • Members of the project team were invited to sit on an Ad-Hoc Expert Group convened by the European Commission to advise on its forthcoming Action Plan for Nanoscience;

Outcome	- Lancaster, Demos and the ESRC co-hosted a public debate entitled 'Is Nano the next GM?' as part of ESRC Social Science Week in June 2004; - A working paper, entitled Bio – to Nano: Learning the Lessons, Interrogating the Comparison, was published and launched at a high-level seminar at the Royal Society. - The project team is a founder member of a newly-created International Nanotechnology in Society Network (INSN), involving researchers from the US, UK, Netherlands, Germany, Denmark and China; - Developed links with nanoscience community in the UK, including extensive links with Cambridge Nanoscience Centre, Oxford Material Science Department and the Bionanotechnology IRC. - The spin-off Demos publication See-through Science: why public engagement needs to move upstream was launched in September 2004 at an event for 200 decision makers, and received coverage in The Guardian, Financial Times and on Radio 4. In an editorial, the journal Nature described it as 'the first coherent call for upstream public engagement' (Nature 2004);

Table 6: EUROPTA

EUROPTA	
Participatory Methods in Technology Assessment and Technology Decision-Making (Download in August 2005 under: http://www.tekno.dk/subpage.php3? article=345&language=uk&category=11&toppic=kategori11)	
Subject / Attendants	Understanding of the role of PTA by critically assessing the experiences to date of different European national participatory initiatives, to identify criteria for the practical implementation of participatory methods, and to contribute to the development of participatory methods and practices in technology assessment.
Objectives and intensions	The project pursued three key objectives: 1) develop a theoretical and analytical framework on the role and function of PTA, as a basis of normative-conceptual discussion and empirical analysis. 2) characterise and compare 16 participatory arrangements in the countries involved, allowing for the study of a broad range of methods, as well as of comparable projects. 3) make recommendations about the use of PTA at a national as well as a (European) international level. The policy recommendations made by the EUROPTA project support the following tasks: 1) To understand and implement PTA as a necessary methodological complementary to traditional TA, when a need for knowledge on public attitudes, social learning, critical (public) discourse, mediation and/or policy support with processes and input is found. 2) To support independent national implementation of PTA, with remit and a position to build up expertise in and perform participation. To diffuse participation to other areas.

Objectives and intensions	3) To ensure improvement and diffusion of PTA methodology, and the conservation of well functioning procedures. To make use of known expertise and experience. 4) To achieve optimal method selection by comprehensive problem situation analysis. Further needed activities supporting the EUROPTA objectives are: **5)** Establish further research concerning: a) Quality criteria relating to the outcomes of participatory technology assessment; b) Development of impact evaluation tools and characterisation of impacts of PTA; c) Comparative analysis of aims, function and impacts of classical versus participatory TA. **6)** International (European) implementation of PTA: a) Pan-European PTA. Modify existing methods with pan-European citizen/expert panels. b) Simultaneous PTA among EU member states, aggregated at European level. **7)** The EUROPTA project should be seen as a starting point for additional activities, including: a) Running dissemination and training seminars on the EUROPTA research outcomes; b) Developing a methodology handbook on participatory TA; c) Setting up a participatory TA network.
Target groups	Panels of citizens, Stakeholders, experts / academics, entrepreneur and governmental officials.
Central technique	Case studies on different deliberative PTA exercises as: Citizens panels, consensus conference, voting conference, , citizens' forum, citizen foresight, future search conference and public debate. Non-deliberative methods: Delphi-surveys, visioning and scenario workshop.

Methodology and concept of incorporation	The project was realised in five consecutive steps. In a first step, a research framework was developed. The aim of this framework was twofold: first, to seek to obtain a comprehensive conceptual basis for considering the issue of participation in relation to technology assessment and, more generally, science and technology policy; and secondly, to achieve a common basis, on which to carry out a comparative empirical analysis of existing participatory initiatives. A draft of this research framework was presented for discussion at a first international workshop in September 1998 in Copenhagen. Three external experts were invited to give formal responses to the framework document, which were then further discussed amongst the 60 workshop participants. On the basis of this workshop, in a second step, the research framework was revised and subsequently a research protocol was designed. The protocol comprised some 30 questions corresponding to the content of the research framework. The purpose of this protocol was to provide a practical tool for the empirical analysis of the participatory initiatives under investigation. For this, a minimum of two case studies were selected in each country (16 altogether). One criterion of selection was to have a broad range of technology-related issues represented in the case studies, from biotechnology, urban transport to energy policy. Another was to include similar participatory methods, so as to allow for direct comparison across institutional and national contexts. In a third step, field research concerning the 16 chosen participatory arrangements was carried out and case study reports were written. This part of the project commenced in autumn 1998, lasting until summer 1999. Some of the involved partner organisations chose to commission external academics to do the research, while others carried it out in-house. In

Methodology and concept of incorporation	the following, fourth step, the project team engaged in transversal analysis, for which initially a series of working hypotheses and observations were formulated. These were subsequently reduced to five themes, including: the introduction of participatory technology assessment in new situations; the political role played by participatory arrangements in different contexts; the functional interrelationship between the objective of a participatory arrangement, the issue treated in the arrangement and the method chosen; the management of participatory arrangements; and the effects of participatory technology assessment on public debate and science and technology policy- and decision-making. The work on the thematic analysis, which was based on the 16 case studies, was done in sub-groups. Together with the case studies, the thematic analysis (in the form of five papers) was presented at a second international workshop in The Hague in October 1999. The aim of this workshop was two-fold, namely to make the findings of the research carried out under this project available to the wider research community, and at the same time to get some feedback about the team's work so far. In the fifth and final step, the project team finalised its analysis, drew conclusions about the lessons learnt from the project, and made recommendations concerning the wider deployment of participatory technology assessment at different institutional, national and international levels.
Outcome	A comparative analysis of the practice and experiences of PTA of the involved countries (Denmark, Germany, Great Britain, Holland, Austria, Switzerland) was carried out. A minimum of two case studies were carried out in each country (16 altogether). Two international workshops have been held as part of the EUROPTA project. The aim of the two international workshops was threefold,

Outcome	namely to make the findings of the research carried out under this project available to the wider research community, diffuse the idea of and debate about PTA and at the same time to get feedback about the team's work.

Table 7: IFOK

IFOK: Governance of the European Research Area – The Role of Civil Society (Download in August 2005 under: http://europe.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/pdf/era-governanceandcivilsociety-programme_en.pdf)	
Subject / Attendants	The general aim of the study is to first promote a better understanding of the conditions required in order to involve civil society effectively in the process of creating the European Research Area and second, as a result of this, to boost the culture of consultation within the scope of research policy and the creation of the European Research Area. Areas of application that are covered by the study are: • risk assessment • technology foresight • science and ethics (ethics councils) • e-governance • public understanding of science • democratising expertise • sustainable development The survey was supported and the convention attended by practitioners from science, public authorities, civil society, industry, research and practise of participatory processes
Objectives and intensions	Following research questions to be answered: • What are the major lines of discussion with regard to the role of civil society in (research-based) policy-making?

Objectives and intensions	- What (scientific) communities deal with these issues? - What kind of civil society participation procedures are applied in Europe (and its regions)? - How can this colourful picture of processes be captured? How can different types of methods and institutional settings be classified? - How are these processes embedded within society? What role do they play within the political decision-making process? - What are the lessons to be learned from the experiences obtained so far? What are the useful practices, which are the pitfalls? - How can civil society participation in research policy-making be improved in the future? What are the significant trends regarding better participation processes? - What can be the role of the Commission in this area?
Target groups	Practitioners of the European research area (Experts / Academics, Stakeholders and policy- and decision-makers)
Central technique	Non-deliberative: The methodology of the study itself has been a participatory one and combined desk research, questionnaire based interviews, expert meetings and peer-reviews.
Methodology and concept of incorporation	An international panel of high-level expertise on civil society participation procedures and research policy-making peer-reviewed the study and supported the IFOK research team by providing substantial input, by discussing criteria for the classification and comparative

Methodology and con-cept of incorporation	assessment and by providing method-logical feedback for the study. • About 70 international experts (scientists and/or practitioners) were interviewed by mail or by phone and contributed their advice and recommendations. • An international conference with strong participatory elements was held in Brussels in June 2003. Roundabout 200 participants coming from 26 European countries and various backgrounds (science, public authorities, civil society, industry, research and practise of participatory processes), had a very fertile exchange in discussing the status quo (as presented in the interim report of this study) and consequently explored new ways towards a more participatory mode of policy-making in the area of RTD.
Outcome	Policy recommendations: • Creating a dynamic and flexible civil society forum • Integrating Participatory Foresight in the Preparation of Framework Programmes and other Strategic Priorities • Europe an Academy for Civil Society Participation in Science and Technology • Citizens debating on science: Universities as platforms for „European Future Days" • „European Science and Society Exchange Program" • Identifying benchmark projects • Supporting Existing Advisory Bodies in the Application of Civil Society Participation • Towards a Convention on civil society participation in research policy-making

Table 8: IRGC

IRGC: The International Risk Governance Council
(Download in November 2005 under: http://www.irgc.org)

Subject / Attendants	The International Risk Governance Council is committed to promote a multidisciplinary, multi-sectoral and multi-regional approach to risk governance. Founded in 2003, IRGC is a Swiss-based private foundation funded by voluntary contributions from the public and private sectors. Its mission is to support governments, business and other organisations and to foster public confidence in risk governance and in related decision-making by - reflecting different views and practices and providing independent, authoritative information; - improving the understanding and assessment of important risks issues and ambiguities involved; - designing innovative, efficient and balanced governance strategies. As subjects, following "problem fields" were identified: - Critical Infrastructures (energy/ water supply systems, structures, I/CT-systems; physical/cyber attacks, vulnerability reduction) - Nanotechnology (problem characterisation, risk appraisal) - Food safety (animal health (BSE/FMD), poisoned classical food; risk appraisal, balance/control) - Genetic Engineering Food and Feed Crops(GM crops and food; risk appraisal, scientific dispute, global perspective) - Databases & Methodologies for Comparative Risk Assessment(basic principles, limits, harmonisation)

Subject / Attendants	• Biodiversity(value of endangered species; problem description, risk appraisal) • Climate change (quality of predictions, physical/societal impacts, abatement techniques; regulation/policies) • Governance in large organizations(governments, industry; correlations, responsibilities, extended norms) • Infectious diseases (spreading mechanisms, risk appraisal; response strategies) • Materials misuse
Objectives and intensions	IRGC works to achieve the mission of supporting governments, industry, NGOs and other organisations in their efforts to deal with major and global risks facing society and to foster public confidence in risk governance by reflecting different views and practices and providing independent, authoritative information, by improving the understanding and assessment of risk and the ambiguities involved, by exploring the future of global risk governance and by designing innovative governance strategies. The council focus on issues, whether human induced or natural, which have international implications and have the potential for harm to human health and safety, the economy, the environment, and/or to the fabric of society at large. IRGC endeavour to work and communicate in ways that account for the needs of both developed and developing countries.
Target groups	Governments, industry, NGOs and other organisations that deal with major and global risks facing society as shown above.
Central technique	Non-deliberative: International expert workshops and conferences.
Methodology and concept of incorporation	An evaluation matrix has been set up to compile problem fields and cross-cutting overriding issues that are in principle envisaged as working fields for the IRGC. The fields have been consciously

Methodology and concept of incorporation	outlined in a broad manner. However, only those have been considered, which call for a broader international, -sectorial, and -disciplinary enterprise. The "problem owners" (and in particular the members of the IRGC Initial Board) have been asked to fill the evaluation matrix and to check the individual topics and specific aspects on completeness as well as relevance and attractiveness for the IRGC. This allowed identification of the most important thematic fields, for which there are interested "clients" and "sponsors". On this basis, it was possible to provide a ranking and to select four most promising tasks to be tackled first by the Scientific and Technical Council ("pilot projects"). The cross-cutting issue, "taxonomy of risks and adequate governance approach", has been judged as "the core of IRGC".
	Although the deliverables present specific differences, they generally go in the direction of
	- compilation, verification and "harmonisation" of scientifically sound methods, tools and data; revelation of remaining disputes and of prevailing uncertainties and ambiguities; provision of verified risk information and noticeable trends ("information platform", "white books"); - formulation of fundamental principles and approaches, of methodologies to be applied and of most promising procedures, endorsed best practices ("generic guidelines"); - delineation of ways to improve efficiency and burden-sharing in risk management, to better control crisis situations, to contribute to better early detection and adequate handling of changing risk patterns ("recommendations").

Outcome	• Inaugural Conference: 171 delegates from 23 countries, (Geneva, 29 June 2004), • General Conference (Beijing, 20 & 21 September 2005), • Establishment of a Scientific and Technical Council (S&TC), • White paper: Risk Governance – Towards an integrated Approach, • Different studies according to the formulated "problem fields" in cooperation with international scientific bodies.

Table 9: NEPA

NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act, USA
(Download in August 2005 under: http://ceq.eh.doe.gov/nepa/nepa25fn.pdf)

Subject / Attendants	The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) was the first law to focus environmental concerns within a comprehensive national policy. NEPA's call for "productive harmony" between "man and nature" presaged today's interest in "sustainable development." The NEPA process is subject to five elements that are critical to its effective and efficient implementation today: • Strategic planning — the extent to which agencies integrate NEPA's goals into their internal planning processes at an early stage; • Public information and input — the extent to which an agency provides information to and takes into account the views of the surrounding community and other interested members of the public during its planning and decision-making process;

Subject / Attendants	• Interagency coordination — how well and how early agencies share information and integrate planning responsibilities with other agencies; • Interdisciplinary place-based approach to decision-making that focuses the knowledge and values from a variety of sources on a specific place; and • Science-based and flexible management approaches once projects are approved.
Objectives and intensions	NEPA provides that federal agency decision-makers, in carrying out their duties, have the responsibility to "use all practicable means" to 1. fulfil the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations; 2. assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings; 3. attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences; 4. preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity and variety of individual choice; 5. achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and 6. enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources.
Target groups	Federal and state agencies, citizens' groups and concerned individuals (the public defined as (1) academicians, (2) non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and citizens, and (3) businesses).

Central technique	Deliberative in some extend: public hearings. Non-deliberative: Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires federal agencies to prepare a "detailed statement" for proposed major actions which significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The statement must include the environmental impacts of the proposed action, alternatives to the proposed action, and any adverse environmental impacts which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented. The following are key terms:
	Environmental Assessment (EA). A concise public document that analyzes the environmental impacts of a proposed federal action and provides sufficient evidence to determine the level of significance of the impacts.
	Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). A public document that briefly presents the reasons why an action will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment and therefore will not require preparation of an environmental impact statement.
	Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The "detailed statement" required by Section 102(2)(C) of NEPA which an agency prepares when its proposed action significantly affects the quality of the human environment.
	Record of Decision (ROD). A public document signed by the agency decision-maker at the time of a decision. The ROD states the decision, alternatives considered, the environmentally preferable alternative or alternatives, factors considered in the agency's decision, mitigation measures that will be implemented, and a description of any applicable enforcement and monitoring programs.

Central technique	**Categorical Exclusion** (CATEX). Categories of actions which normally do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and for which, therefore, an EA or an EIS is not required. **Cumulative Impact**. The impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions regardless of what agency, federal or nonfederal, or what person undertakes the action.
Methodology and concept of incorporation	NEPA provides agencies an extraordinary opportunity to respond to citizen needs and build trust in surrounding communities. Agencies that are responsive exceed legal requirements and involve communities early and often in the NEPA process, study the issues they have been asked to study, and incorporate citizens' comments and concerns. Agency managers who have learned to use NEPA have discovered it helps them do their jobs. It can make it easier to discourage poor proposals, reduce the amount of documentation down the road, and support innovation. NEPA helps managers make better decisions, produce better results, and build trust in surrounding communities. It makes good economic sense, and it is, quite simply, good government.
Outcome	One of the original purposes of NEPA was to coordinate federal environmental problem-solving. Yet, almost all participants saw the continued need for more coordination among agencies proposing projects. Additionally, almost all participants urged better-coordinated activities among the numerous federal, state, and local environmental laws, regulations, and requirements, even beyond those related to NEPA. The majority of participants applauded NEPA for opening the federal process to public input and were convinced that this open process has improved the effectiveness

Outcome	of project design and implementation, while minimizing environmental impacts. On the other hand, however, they highlighted that this open ness and responsiveness still varies considerably from agency to agency. **To highlight one finding:** NGOs and citizens still view the NEPA process as a one-way communication process, sceptical that their input is being effectively incorporated into agency decision-making and hypothesizing that their involvement is often solicited too late in the process, after decisions regarding actions and alternatives have been made.

Table 10: PATH

PATH: Participatory Approaches in Science and Technology(Science and Society Coordination Action funded under European Commission 6th Framework Programme for Research.) (Download in November 2005 under: http://www.macaulay.ac.uk/PATHconference/)	
Subject / Attendants	The PATH project – Participatory approaches in science and technology – is developing a network that will bring together academics, policy-makers, industry, NGOs and other members of civic society to examine ways of boosting European public participation in science policy development. PATH will examine these issues via three case studies in areas that have caught the public interest: • genetically modified organisms in agriculture, • biodiversity conservation, and • nanotechnology.

Objectives and intensions	Involving citizens in dialogue with the research community and policy-makers, and involving them in setting the research agenda, is a cornerstone of the good governance and the European Union's commitment to public participation and consultation. The public should have the opportunity to voice their opinions on science and research policy matters. PATH seeks to match these aspirations by developing ways of improving the scale and representation of public participation. By getting academics, policy-makers and citizens' groups together, PATH will help produce a better understanding of how the public currently participate in science policy deliberations. It could also stimulate better community policy-making in the future. Indeed, changes brought about by more public participation could alter the way the research agenda is set, making it reflect more closely the needs and ambitions of society.
Target groups	People who share experiences, and explore future directions for public participation in science based policymaking. It will therefore be of interest to academics including PhD students; those involved in policymaking which requires a scientific evidence base; participation practitioners; and government and non-government organisations.
Central technique(s)	Deliberative / non-deliberative: The incorporation of participation practitioners and NGOs may include semi-expert citizens but the overall method is based on focus groups.
Methodology and concept of incorporation	The PATH conference aims to explore how best to involve Stakeholders and the public in policy development and decision-making on science and technology issues. The conference will bring together policy makers, practitioners and academics to exchange knowledge and explore future directions for public participation in these areas. Using a combination of keynote speakers; papers addressing state of the art theory and practical ex-

Methodology and concept of incorporation	amples; and interactive sessions exploring best practice approaches, participants will consider experiences and innovative ideas from around the world. The conference will be small and focussed with a limited attendance of around 120 delegates.
Outcome (expected)	• An international workshop focusing on issues of scale and representation • An international conference aimed at integrating best practice in science-based policy deliberations, and coming up with future directions in the three case study areas (4th - 7th June 2006) • The dissemination of project outcomes to a wide audience through policy briefings, conference proceedings, articles for journals, reports, and via the project website

2.2   Initial Comparison – Summary

Two of the chosen approaches for conducting PTAs, IRGC and NEPA do not intend to foster European identity or to strengthen an inclusive participatory debate of lay people on questions of science and technology. Nevertheless, they are following the need to pay greater attention to the public outside governmental bodies defined as scientific and expert actors or semi-expert citizens' groups and highly concerned individuals. The "crisis of legitimacy" faced by institutions is still one of the key problems that are addressed even by those institutions that have placed their focus more on integration of different epistemic communities rather than an on the involvement of Stakeholders and the public at large (Pimpert, Wakeford: 2001). Therefore, all the programmes address the issue involving other actors than the regulators or technology developers with the purpose in mind to enhance democratic legitimacy and add more plural knowledge and

values into the assessment as well as management process with respect to new technologies and other risky activities.

Focused on the European level, the ADAPTA project underscores the observation that the forms of public participation are diverse in their structures. They can be described as formal (PTA as formal dialogue arrangements) and informal forms of arrangements (direct actions initiated by NGOs, trials at court etc.) resulting from social actor's direct intervention in the public debate.

> "(…) when public debate has already developed, the possibility to influence it through PTA is very low. However, it is possible to better inform the policy process through "materialisation of the public opinion". Stakeholders may learn that, beyond a strong polarisation of the public debate, the attitudes of lay people are not strongly anchored against GM Food but that they claim for a fair consideration of their concerns, interests and values in the innovation and the regulatory processes. Therefore, even if the results of the PTA exercises (recommendations of the panel in a CC,…) do not conduct to direct effects, they do have important indirect effects since they broaden the view of the Stakeholders on the socio-political dimensions of the issue…" (Joly / Assouline 2001: 87).

Another distinguishing feature can be seen in the use of deliberative methods vs. non-deliberative ones in participation of the public. This categorization was mainly done in reference to the work of Abelson, Eyles, Smith et al 2003, that groups citizens juries, citizens panels, planning cells, consensus conferences and deliberative polling in the first type of method and focus groups, consensus building exercises, surveys, public hearings, open houses, citizen advisory committees, community planning, visioning etc. in the second class of consultation methods. The distinction into the two classes marks the differences in the quality of involvement, the nature of the recommendations, the assimilation of views and the depth of power-sharing (simi-

lar to ADAPTA) of directly concerned individuals in issues of science and technology.

The review of the PTA approaches underlines the novelty and innovativeness of the ECD-Method. The ratio of national and European panels incorporating citizens, Stakeholders, scientist and experts designed in an explorative approach is quite exceptional and unprecedented. The ECD method relies heavily on the use of citizen panels. How do these panels operate?

The citizen's panel is similar to "citizen juries" (Renn, Webler, Wiedemann 1995: 344f.) in that its purpose is to incorporate the informed views of citizens into the policy process, after they have been given information and had an opportunity to discuss the issue (Toogood: 2000). However, the concept of a panel is much more flexible than the citizen's jury – in its most basic form it is simply a means of exploring and capturing the views of an informed public on a policy issue. (Studd: 2002) The traditional citizen's panel consist of a random selection of about 10-25 citizens, but citizens' panels can be augmented to much larger groups of up to 5000 members from which representatives are taken and included in the assessment or decision making process. The number of times they meet depends on the issue. It can range from a intensive 2-3 day meeting, to regular meetings over a couple of months, to a panel lasting the lifespan of a particular project. Panels are provided with access to expert information usually through a series of speakers, but this can be provided through computer models (Toogood: 2000). Moderated and facilitated discussions are included in the process as a means to initiate an extensive learning experience about the different arguments and viewpoints associated with the issue in question (Webler et al.: 1995). A report is drafted by the moderator and discussed with the panel members before being presented to the sponsoring groups. Citizens' panels work best if asked to develop policy options, evaluate and review current practice and/or suggest changes in policy directions (Toogood: 2000).

The extent of deliberation differs because the range of applications of the citizens' panel model is flexible, the balance between analytic expert information and group deliberation depends on the objectives of the process and the policy issue (Stern and Fineberg 1996). In comparison with the citizens' jury, citizens' panels tend to be more open and flexible processes with greater emphasis on exploring the views and perceptions of the public rather than discussing and making judgements on expert presentations. There is a strong educative element to the process as illustrated by Renn et al who use a citizen panel to

> "(…) provide citizens with the opportunity to learn about the technical and political facets of policy options and to enable them to discuss and evaluate these options and their likely consequences according to their own set of values and preferences."
> (Renn et al 1993:191).

Similar to the model of Citizen Juries however, the process does not allow for direct deliberation between panellists, policy-makers and experts.

2.3   Initial Interviews

The initial interviews provided background material for the further analysis. The results of the initial interviews will be reported accordingly to the statements of Stakeholders and Facilitators. This comparison helps to understand the motivations of each actor in the process, to gain a better understanding of the organisational structure and to use it as a benchmark against which the outcomes of the whole process can be evaluated.

3   The First Citizens' Convention

3.1   Interviews - Methods and Approach

By means of systematic observation the evaluation team collected information about the Convention process, special events or incidents and logistic and structural aspects. The team interviewed key actors in order to gain a realistic picture of the intentions, the expectations and perceptions of the participants.

The Facilitators of the Plenary Sessions and of the discussion tables acted as intermediaries between the organizers and the participants during the whole assembly process. They occupy an important position in commenting and judging the interactions they have conducted. In addition to five "central interviews" with the Facilitators, two interviews were conducted with the KBF coordinative team leaders ("initial interviews") and seven with Stakeholders. The interviews took place immediately in the aftermath of the First Citizens' Convention or shortly after the event. Three central interviews and one interview with a coordinator were done face-to-face. One Facilitator and one Stakeholder answered the questions in writing. The remaining interviews were conducted via telephone.

Form a methodological viewpoint the method used for the interviews can be grouped among the qualitative instruments of issue-oriented semi-structured exploration. All interviews were tape recorded. The "central interviews" consists of 22 open questions. Some of the major topics covered in the interview referred to:

- What are the main objectives of the ECD-Project from the perspective of the interviewed person; was the Convention perceived as successful and meeting these objectives?

- Do the expectations correspond with the final impressions of the interviewed person after experiencing the first meeting?

- How did the respondents assess the process (in regard to efficiency, productivity and the table design)?

- What kind of problems were perceived actually and what kind of problems are expected in future?

- How did the respondents self-describe their personal role in this process; how did they attempt to meet this role and did they feel well prepared for conducting their respective tasks?

- One question relating to methodology: How did the respondents judge the approach of the ECD-Project to incorporate science in the ECD-Project and how did they evaluate the methods that were used to meet the purpose of the whole exercise? Were they satisfied with the methods of citizen involvement?

- Did they believe that every citizen had gotten a fair opportunity to contribute to the process and to the results?

- How did they assess and evaluate the role of KBF?

- Were they convinced that the ECD-Project was able to facilitate a European identity amongst the citizens?

- How did the key actors perceive the degree of commitment of the citizens' as well as their (discourse-) competence?

At the beginning of the interviews all respondents received information about the intentions of the interview and a rough outline of the issues that would be addressed during the interview. The interviewers also assured the respondents that all answers were kept confidential.

3.2   Interviews - Framework and Results

One of our basic findings is that the statements and attitudes of the interviewees are strongly related to their function in the process creating a sphere of action with special communication and interaction patterns and special practices related to the issues the respondents were asked to manage. Actors who share the same functions or positions within the project, often share the same perspective and show almost identical patterns of perception.

In the context of this relationship between perspectives and the function within the project could be linked to the sociological term of HABITUS (Bourdieu 1990: 55f). French social scientist Pierre Bourdieu introduced the following definition of habitus :

(…) "being the product of particular class of objective regularities, the habitus tends to generate all the 'reasonable', 'common-sense', behaviour (and only these) which are possible within the limits of these regularities, and which are likely to be positively sanctioned because they are objectively adjusted to the logic characteristic of a particular field, whose objective future they anticipate." (Bourdieu 1990: 55f)

In line with the concept of habitus, the importance of the functional level for perceiving and evaluating the whole process is visible in three different domains of practice, which can be analytically related to the micro, meso and macro level (cf. Table 11).

Table 11: Actors' Habitus and Sphere of Action

Actor / Role	Level	Practical Habitus
Facilitator	Micro (at the tables)	Practice-oriented / Mediating / Translating purpose into action
Coordinative professionals	Meso (at the convention)	Initiating, Organising & Supporting
Stakeholders	Macro (distance to convention in itself)	Research oriented / Basically scientific interest / Focussed on policy making

The allocation of the Main-Facilitators was more difficult to perform. They were allocated to the micro level, but they could also belong to the meso level. The Steering Committee as a fourth functional group were positioned at the meso level because of it's role of providing instructions for the entire process.

The functional differences also played a major role in the perception of the respondents with respect to culture of cooperation and communication, which will be covered in more detail in the next section. The functional habitus was also strong with respect to :

- perceptions regarding the major objectives of the Meeting of Minds-Project,

- assessments of the (expected) results and the success of the process,

- the efficiency of the methods and techniques used,

- problems that occurred or that are expected by the interviewed key actors,

- the role description and the self - assessment of the Facilitators,

- the incorporation of the science,

- assessment of the role of the KBF,

- citizens commitment and the question, whether ECD can foster an European identity.

The next sections will summarize the results of each of these aspects by comparing the members of the three functional domains: Facilitators, Coordinators and Stakeholders. Not all items in our questionnaire were directed to each respondent. Some items were not relevant for them. In this case we report only the results from the relevant actors. To provide for better readability, a table has been produced summarising the statements made by the interviewees after each subsection.

3.2.1   Anticipated Major Objectives, Assessment of Success and Expected Results

The Micro-Level: Facilitators

The Facilitators regard as their major tasks on the Convention, to trigger questions for national assessment and to test out the first convention process. They mentioned as another important goal, to promote the participants' commitment and enthusiasm. In the eyes of the Facilitators they had to generate and to demonstrate the process, but a purpose was also to learn from the process. The Facilitators should help in a process of development leading to an informed political opinion of the participants. In the Facilitators' view another task was to convince the participants that their personal engagement will have a crucial impact on the results of the Convention and will also reach the European level. Another important objective, the Facilitators said that they should convey to the citizens that the result can be used for the creation of a common European perspective on this topic by integrating viewpoints and arguments across different countries. These

goals were accompanied by the instrumental objective to reduce the distance between experts and laypersons, especially for issues that do or will strongly affect the daily life of many people.

All those Facilitators participating in our survey stated that the Convention was rated a success with respect to the depth of the outcome and the creation of a truly European atmosphere. In the eyes of the interviewees one possible problem regarding the outcome could be, that the variance in the range of questions may cause irritations in the first moment. But the process in their view is robust enough to initiate a self-corrective process in the national assessments.

Referring to the process-level, most expectations of the Facilitators were in line with the project's goals. Most respondents echoed the stated goals of the project. Some Facilitators did not express any specific expectations: One interviewee remarked that he was here as a "slip into the process". Those, however, who voiced expectations concluded that their expectations were absolutely achieved during the First Convention. The output, in their view, turned out surprisingly rich and colourful. In the attempt not to loose any details they had the feeling the many thoughts generated in the process did not correspond with a similar variety of actions. The tension here lies between deliberation and practicality. They recommended that this tension should be addressed in the meetings to follow.

The Meso-Level: Coordinators

On the meso-level, the coordinators pointed out that their main objective has been to create a European perspective on brain sciences across the nations. In the pursuit of this goal, they like to strengthen innovative methods in participatory governance and to support public participation on science and technology. Participation in their view should include the opportunity for citizens to frame the impact of society, to co-determine the policy-agenda, and to promote a European awareness for these issues. For them the Meeting of Minds is only an example, however important, for facilitating institutional

changes in the European governance process aimed at linking European policy making with citizens' visions, expectations and preferences.

At this stage of the project, the respondents felt it difficult to assess the success of the project so far and to compare the obtained results with their expectations. As the coordinators expect to bridge the gap between decision makers and the public, success or failure of this expectation will not become visible until after the whole project is completed. They did voice, however, their overall satisfactions with the Convention. They believed similar to the Facilitators that the Convention provided very intense and exiting experiences for the citizens. Despite the complexity of the subject and the process they felt that almost none of the participants was dissatisfied in the end. They regarded the Convention as a very precious, powerful but also learning-intensive experience for individuals.

The Macro-Level : Stakeholders

As can be expected, opinions and evaluations from the group of Stakeholders showed the largest variation of attitudes and opinions. The Stakeholder came from very different backgrounds and represent different interests. They agreed, however, in their assessment of the project's purpose. They saw it as an attempt to confront decision makers at all levels and branches of governments with the concerns of "ordinary" laypersons about brain science. Although all Stakeholders welcomed the project and voiced their support for the notion of bridging the gap between experts, policy-makers, the Stakeholders and the public, they differed in their expectations. Some felt that the deliberation results should have only consultative power by feeding preferences back to the decision makers. Other expressed their opinion that the citizens should be given the opportunity to influence policy making directly and be seen as partners in the decision making process not just as providers of information. Regardless of the final use of the results, the Stakeholders found the process suitable to promote social participation and social control of brain research and

to propose regulations for long-termed planning of research policies. One of the Stakeholders pointed out that the major objective is to carry out a democratic experiment towards "Knowledge Society" that will be valuable without any doubt.

The Stakeholders were reluctant to comment on the success or failure of the process because they want to wait for further results. They did, however, share the impression with the two other groups that the citizens appeared to feel satisfied with their role and their function as consultants. They also agreed that ECD is a very innovative idea and could, if the results meet the expectations, function as a model for a democratic process for shaping future strategies of research.

Table 12: Perception of Objectives / Success and Expected Results

	Facilitators	Coordinative Professionals	Stakeholders
Main Objectives	• Coming up with new questions for national assessment • Testing out first convention-process • Promoting enthusiasm and commitment of citizens • Generating, demonstrating and learning in methodology • Attract citizens' to participate in developing opinion process (deliberation) • Mediate that	• Create European perspective on issue • To strengthen innovative methods in participatory governance • Support public participation on science & technology related issues • Promoting the idea of participatory governance • Framing impact of society on policy-agenda, toward deci-	• Confronting decision-/ policy-makers with concerns of laypersons about brain science but also • Deliberation of non-experts upon highly scientific, societal & ethical questions the experts can profit from • Bridging any disconnections between experts, public and decision-makers • Promoting so-

	• citizens' engagement has impact • Convey that citizens' results can be used on European solutions for complex issues • Reducing distance between experts and laypersons	• sion-makers • Invitation to reflect the use of public participation & participatory governance on European scale • Developing questions outside ECD on brain science and • on methods/tools to combine citizens' point of views	• cial participation & control of brain research; helping to regulate long-time research planning's • Democratic experiment towards Knowledge Society
Success	• Depth of output • Variance within result (may cause irritations) vs. self-correcting process • Creating European atmosphere • Enthusiasm & Commitment • Positive "resistance" of citizens (constructive discourse)	• Generally difficult to assess the success at this stage, but: • Expected to bridge disconnection between decision-makers and public • Nobody unsatisfied • Convention precious, powerful learning-intensive	• At this stage to early but some expected results were obtained
Expected Results	• Yes, at all / Yes, so far ("slip into process") • Expected time-problem didn't occur	• Convention provided intense & exiting experiences for citizens'	• Citizens' satisfied with being invited/ consulted • ECD seems to be a model for

	• Depth of output/process can create tension between deliberation and ability to act	• Despite complexity almost nobody was unsatisfied	democratic process that will influence research-strategies in future

3.2.2   The Efficiency of the Design and the Used Methods

The Micro-Level: Facilitators

The process in general was perceived efficient, fast and precise although the confusion coming up on Sunday were noted as an exception. The shift from table-group to Plenary and the exchange of results were perceived as was well organised and effective. Despite the big amount of information and the large number of persons involved, the design appeared to be robust but also flexible. The table design received high praise and was seen as essential for citizens panels of this magnitude. None of the Facilitators could think of a better alternative. Exchanges in the Plenary are very limiting by nature so that the design of mixing small group discussions with Plenary meetings were appealing to the Facilitators. Only one Facilitator voiced the opinion that the Plenary part should have been extended because, in her eyes, it proved more efficient than the group sessions. All others shared the impression that the structure of group discussion and Plenary sessions was about right.

One main point that was directly and also indirectly mentioned was the narrow time frame. The time problem was particularly serious for the Table-Facilitators who needed consecutive language interpretation. There was also not enough time for sorting out confusing instructions or rather complex tasks.

The service of the simultaneous and consecutive Interpreters was perceived as highly efficient and necessary because it helped people to understand one another across the language barriers. The feedback system was also seen as serving the main purpose of having all participants share the same information and being informed about the products of deliberation. Last but not least, the logistical support at every step of the way was vigorously applauded by the Facilitators. Less staffing would have been a disaster – so at least some of the respondents. The multi-media devices to conduct the polling and to collect the table-results and bring them to the Plenary were highly appreciated.

Table 13: Efficiency of Design and Methods

Facilitators
• Fast, precise and efficient design of the convention (especially on Saturday)
• Despite the big amount of information and number of people the design was robust but also flexible
• Table-design is essential for citizens' panels
• Exchange of dialogue in plenary is restricted by nature
• Time problem – critical especially when situation tends to become confusing or dependence on consecutive language interpretation
• Simultaneous and consecutive language interpretation highly efficient -> it makes in general people understand each other across language barriers
• Excellent logistical support by staff - is perceived as indispensable
• Multi-media devices help to conduct polling and to collect table-results right in time

3.2.3   Actual Problems and Expected Problems in the Future

Micro-Level: Facilitators

According to the opinion of some interviewees there existed differences regarding the "quality" of the Facilitators (term of an interviewed Facilitator). Several Facilitators did not keep their table under control or had language problems. A few Facilitators reported that some of their colleagues ignored central messages and misinterpreted tasks that the citizens were supposed to deliver. For instance, some of the "Issue-Facilitators" had problems in understanding the precise meaning of American-English terms that were used by the Main - Facilitator Daniel Stone.

Another translation related problem was addressed to the Theme-Team. Sometimes the interpretations did not match the output of the tables. In reaction of this mismatch, a number of citizens asked for more precision with respect to the summaries and comments that were given to them. How to transfer the results of a single table to the others through a process of reformulation and summarizing by the Theme-Team and to re-transfer the abstract level back to the tables again remains an open problem that was not fully resolved during the convention. With respect to the preparation of the Facilitators several respondents criticized the top-down approach through the Steering Committee. Among the critical remarks were that the Facilitators had only short time for preparation and did not get involved in the overall process from the beginning. Instead of training in focus groups, one important briefing took place shortly before the Convention for about two hours via telephone-conference. Another point of criticism was that the information material for the Facilitators was handed out only a little time before the Convention started. This caused avoidable problems concerning the later performance during the convention. In addition, the respondents found it not acceptable that the Facilitators were not allowed to make any suggestions for

improvement, neither before the Convention nor during the Convention, in particular during the critical situation on Sunday. The Facilitators felt a sense of discomfort with the chosen top down management style but could also see a need for a consistent and univocal approach. As "people in the frontline", they opted for more involvement in the decision making process. This criticism was shared by all respondents. In the eyes of the Facilitators, another problem complicated the situation. The Steering Committee changed its mind during the Convention and did not communicate that the Facilitators were responsible for implementing the modifications and informing their group.

Turning to the perception of logistics, some problems occurred right at the beginning of the weekend when citizens did not find their respective group when leaving the airport.

The "voting exercise" (the "crisis" situation) on Sunday morning was not seen as a disruption of the process but as a normal procedure and a understandable reaction with positive transforming results. The choice of the citizens to increase the number of themes and discuss the scope of their work was seen as a sign of empowerment not of weakness of the process. The respondents agreed that the whole process could have been engineered differently and more smoothly - but to do so would have obstructed the deliberation process of the citizen'.

To deal with such a large range of themes is seen as a major challenge for the future deliberations. One Facilitator suggested to meet this challenge by not spending to much time on the process of identifying new questions and Themes rather than to discuss the existing ones more in depth. In managing possible crisis, the size and composition of the Steering Committee may need to be readjusted, so that it would not take to much time to sort out the problems and respond timely.

The Meso-Level: Coordinators

One respondent mentioned that the cooperating institutions and the members of the initial consortium had a long standing tradition in dealing with questions on science and technology. But these tradition do not all match. "They found their best recipes and making a cocktail is very difficult", this interviewee stated. Since nobody ever has done anything comparable to Meeting of Minds before, the Convention was seen as a success in spite of differences in philosophy and tradition. Other than this, the respondents did not foresee any specific problems in the future. They expressed, however, some uncertainty about the resonance of the process among the Stakeholders and the relationship between the citizens, the organisers and the Stakeholders.

The Macro-Level: Stakeholders

Many Stakeholders echoed the translation and language problems. They expressed their feeling that many important subtleties and contextual semantics got lost in translation. They also touched upon a more fundamental question. They thought that some fractions of ECD-Project did not understand the scope and limits of regulation in transforming the results of the process into concrete policy measures.

Other points mentioned were that the ECD-Process should be escorted by a fostered national discussion because experience for a public debate on brain science on the European-level is still missing. Another Stakeholder mentioned that he detected a strong bias towards disease during the Theme collecting exercise, although brain science could provide a much wider range of applications. To him it is not clear whether the cases were meant to stimulate discussion or to find a common platform that could be attractive to all members and the different countries. One respondent suggested to involve a greater variety of experts on a larger extent to launch more precise points of interest beside medical terms. Another Stakeholder argued in the same direction that the Meeting of Minds started from the wrong

point: because of being uninformed, the citizens' do need more information provided by scientist and after that kind of deliberation the national panel should start to work. "Start with providing the public with scientific information and afterwards with laypersons' questions!" One was wondering why six specific neuro-scientific questions out of a first Stakeholder-meeting were replaced by questions of a broader content. This may shorten the necessary discussion about ethical issues on progress in brain science. Finally this Stakeholder was wondering whether the Facilitators have got the abilities to guide through such a discussion. Last but not least it has to be said that some Stakeholders did not encountered any problems at all because of being right at the beginning of the process. So far it can be concluded that there are critical voices among the Stakeholders, but basically there is a more positive disposition under the motto "wait and see". The most Stakeholders appreciated how Meeting of Minds supported the deliberation and consultation of lay people. That citizens statements directly orientated towards the scientists' in formulating desired research targets and its priorities was named clearly as an important outcome.

Future problems may occur in the preparation of a real critical synthesis of the results and in the area of different value systems additionally to the different ethical approaches to research in the field of brain science. Another problem, that may not be seen as trivial, is when actually nothing will happen especially on the European-level after the process is completed. Some people who were involved with certain very special areas of interest maybe can not continue with their commitment in future.

Table 14: Current and Expected Problems

	Facilitators	Coordinative Professionals	Stakeholders
Current Problems	• Differences in Facilitator - quality • Some Facilitators had difficulties to keep their table under control • Language problems in understanding the correct meaning of American-English • Interpretations of theme-team sometimes did not match with table-output • Preparation through Steering Committee top-down • Facilitators must be involved from the beginning • Preparation shortly before convention (material and telephone-conference) • Steering Committee changed mind during convention - Fa-	• Long traditions in dealing with questions on science & technology by cooperating organisations • Nobody has done beforehand • Technological and logistical challenge	• Translation and language problems may occur because of loosing subtleties and contextual semantics • Some fractions of ECD did not understand the limits of regulatory system • National discussions should escort the international process • Limited experience for public debate on brain science in Europe • Strong bias towards disease in the debate • Cases do not stimulate exchange among citizens to cross country differences so far • Involvement a greater variety of experts • Started wrong: first inform the

	cilitators had to deal with • Logistic tasks must be performed more accurate • Bringing the whole process together is very challenging - that might constitute also a problem in the future • Transferring results from one table to other via abstraction through theme-team and re-transfer to table back		citizens (laypersons) • Lack of discussion about ethical issues on progress in brain science • Wondering, whether Facilitators can guide through issue • Desirable Outcome: clear statement of the citizens regarding desirable research objectives
Expected Problems	• Dealing with range of themes in order to cover full breadth • Identifying new question rather to discuss existing ones • Size of steering committee is to big in order to manage possible crisis sufficiently	• Not really expected: That certainty about actual relationship with key Stakeholders may decrease	• Being not able to prepare a real critical synthesis of results + • a synthesis in area of different value systems • Nothing happen on European level after ECD-Process is finished • Reduction of some specialists' commitment

3.2.4   Role-Description and -Assessment, Preparation of the Facilitators

The Micro-Level: Facilitators

The Facilitators are not going to limit their area of responsibility to mediation and moderation. They describe themselves as key- and team-players and some noted that they could have also taken part in the Steering Committee in a structuring and instructive position by qualification.

What they are doing in general is to create "safe" places at the tables as well related to the task of transmitting the discussion-results to the writing unit of the entire dialog in order to support and structure the whole process. The Facilitators, talking about Meeting of Minds, clearly perceived, that the responsibility was outsourced to the Steering Committee and the Main-Facilitator. Therefore, the Facilitators concentrated only on their tables. Nevertheless, a number of Facilitators felt insufficiently prepared. The cooperation with the Rapporteurs worked well in situations under pressure, but generally it would have been better to meet the other key-players beforehand.

The preparation of the Convention was well done to a large extend, but several points of critique were mentioned, which can not be ignored. On the whole it was to much paper to deal with. The time-scheduling of methods and design could have been more Facilitator friendly. The rough design was finished just one week before the first Convention took place and the definite design has reached the Facilitators in a minute at the evening the day before the Convention started. Additionally, some irregularities between "reality" and interpretations at the debriefing were perceived. By some Facilitators, the relationship with the Steering Committee is described as rather "authoritarian" and they emphasised, that the Steering Committee decided on it's own and tolerated no suggestions for improvement. The organizers gave no insight regarding the real organisational structures to the Facilitators.

Table 15: Role Perception & Preparation

	Facilitators
Self-Description of Personal Role	• Key-players with ability to run instructional tasks besides moderation and mediation • Creating "safe" places on a micro-level: tables and citizens' • Creating "safe" places on a macro-level by transmitting and mediating results
Attempt to Met the Role	• Responsibilities were outsourced to Steering Committee • Concentrated on table-work with citizens' • Cooperating with other key-players
Feeling Prepared for Work	• To a large extend preparation was well done • To much paper • Important information on rough and definite design arrived very short in time • Irregularities between reality and debriefing • Steering Committee is not tolerating suggestions for improvement • No insight into real organisational structures

3.2.5   Incorporation of Science and the Citizens' - Citizens' Opportunity to Contribute

The Micro-Level: Facilitators

One Facilitator stated, that the Steering Committee was responsible for decisions of design and that there was a deliberate attempt not to involve a tremendous amount of science into this Convention. Other Facilitators described the incorporation of science as quite good especially the case study book appeared to be an excellent introduction.

Strategies to incorporate citizens' are talking slowly, having direct eye contact, moderating one person after another (serial processing)

and in correcting the order of sitting by alternating calm and lively persons. Another one important aspect is to create conditions that help to mediate the impression to the citizens, that their voices are heard.

In the view of the Facilitators, the opportunity to contribute to the process at the First Citizen Convention was always provided and possible without any exception. That is a trivial aspect, e.g. in the case of disturbance or misbehaviour.

Table 16: Incorporation Science & Citizens'

	Facilitators
Science	• Attempted not to involve too much science • Case study book is an excellent introduction • In national panels the incorporation of science and experts differ
Citizens' Involvement	• Using regular moderating techniques as: 　　　- talking slowly 　　　- direct eye contact 　　　- moderating one person after another 　　　- correcting the sitting order (calm / lively) • Good frame conditions (high effort of supporting services..)
Opportunity to Contribute	• No exceptions – every citizen was invited and able to participate

3.2.6   Assessing the Role of the King Baudouin Foundation

The Micro-level: Facilitators

The King Baudouin Foundation was described without exceptions as a very professional coordinator and initiator of the ECD-Project. All over the Convention it was highly supportive, committed and embodying the spirit of citizens' deliberation. Gerrit Rauws played an important role during the resumption of the dialog after the "crisis" on Sunday morning.

The Meso-level: Coordinative Professionals

KBF is one of the initiating main actors of the ECD-Project. Pre-considerations took place in the frame of it's governance programme in 2001. The foundation regards itself as an explicit European actor with the intension to rise up questions on society and technology on the European-level. As state-governments do have certain interests, the KBF is completely neutral in economical, ideological or philosophical matters especially in regard to the chosen topic brain science.

The Macro-Level: Stakeholders

The KBF is seen by the Stakeholders as a neutral facilitator; objective at all and very cooperative and supportive.

Table 17: Summary Role of the KBF

	Facilitators	Coordinative Professionals	Stakeholders
KBF-Role	• Professional coordinator • One of the initiating	• One of the project-initiating main actors • Explicit Euro-	• Neutral Facilitator • Objective • Cooperative

	organisations the ECD-Project • Embodies the spirit of citizens' deliberation • Gerrit Rauws played a crucial role in managing the "crisis" on Sunday morning	pean actor with the intension to bring up questions on society and technology on European level • Completely neutral in economical, ideological and philosophical sense • Promoting the idea of participatory governance	• Supportive

3.2.7   European Identity and Commitment of the Citizens

The Micro-Level: Facilitators

The Facilitators assessed the commitment of the citizens' as overwhelming and very enthusiastic. The participants were altogether very exited and curios. On the European-level the Convention helped to make the citizens sensitive – even physically – for the ongoing European process of which they became participants in a very active sense. Another interviewee exercised restraint in being convinced of this effect because, even though focussing on the similarities instead to benefit from the differences can be suboptimal in the consequences. One Facilitator understands the Meeting of Minds as a counter-movement to the negative impressions which are connected to the results of resent referendum.

The Meso-Level: Coordinative Professionals

If and how Europe can be fostered in establishing an own identity is still an open question because of the methodologically explorative approach of the process. The interviewee expected that some general cultural differences between the northern, southern, eastern and western countries of Europe may lead to different discursive perceptions of the initial questions in the beginning. However, in the end the differences were widely accepted respectively could have been negotiated. Another interviewee answered that the ECD-Project, and especially the first convention definitely helped to reach the objective of fostering an European identity because it was a strong experience for every participant.

The Macro-Level: Stakeholders

Another outcome of the Convention was the possibility to expand and strengthen European identity among the participants. The citizens participated in the process as European citizens what was a kind of interesting "spin off" because the ECD-Project supported this effect just by bringing people together from across borders to work on a common project. This project, could have a positive impact on the view, that this is an European exercise and not a member state exercise. Finally one of the Stakeholders mentioned that the project must have an impact if it is the first time for many citizens' they have met people from abroad all the time and found that easy to deal with. The stakeholders stated, that this kind of activity can only encourage people to establish a real European identity. The ECD-Project offered a wonderful chance to exchange inter-culturally and discursively. Nevertheless the "individual" backgrounds (culture, socialisation, perception in advance etc.) were also perceived as aspects for causing problems during the process, what was not reflected during the preparation.

Table 18: European Identity, Citizens' Commitment and Competence

	Facilitators	Coordinative Professionals	Stakeholders
ECD-Project establishing a European identity	• European-level helped to make the citizens' sensitive for European processes • It can be problematic to focus on similarities instead to benefit from differences • Meeting of Minds – Project to be understood as a counter-movement to the results of resent referendum	• If and how Europe can benefit is still an open question due to the explorative approach of ECD • ECD-Project - and First Convention especially - helped to achieve this objective, because it was such a strong experience for everybody	• Possibility to expand an European identity especially in an issue that is possibly different perceived in the US • European identity would be a logical kind of spin off • Project is clearly European and not a single member state exercise • Must have an positive effect to have met people from abroad all the time and found that easy to deal with
Citizens' commitment	• Commitment was overwhelming • Very exited and curious citizens'		
Citizens' discoursivity		• Difference between West / East / North / South of Europe led to different	• Project offers chance to exchange interculturally and discoursively as

		perceptions in the begin – later well accepted	well

3.3　　Summary of Interviews

Summary Objectives, Success and Obtaining Expected Results

The Convention and the whole ECD-Project was perceived as a successful process so far. In terms of the coordinators: "Nobody was unsatisfied". The interview partners on the micro-level especially referred to the depth and the breadth of the Convention's results (Themes and questions). A possible effect of this colourful outcome might be that people are irritated during the next steps of the overall process. The tension between variance vs. the "action-ability" of results in the whole process was perceived by the Facilitators in particular. The Interviewees mentioned that problems to deal with the range of Themes probably could occurr in the future. But these difficulties were perceived more as challenge than as problem. Another problem is being seen by Facilitators in putting the parts of the whole process together.

A coordinator pronounced, that the Convention was "learning-intensive". Bearing in mind that one of the objectives is to push methodical progress in public participation, this statement shows also the successful "internal" outcome of the process.

The Stakeholders were the group with the most disparity in perspectives and attitudes. That is not only an effect of the number of members. The Stakeholders differ because of their societal, here especially organisational, political and ethical background. Their expertise was strongly related to their profession.

The Stakeholders became aware of the citizens' satisfaction with the ECD-Process so far and their enthusiasm in being a part of it. Addi-

tionally the Stakeholders appreciated the initiation of a processes of participation and deliberation regarding the topic brain science. The Stakeholders, but also other key actors mentioned as main objective of ECD-Project to bridge the gap between experts and laypersons, respectively public and decision makers. Nevertheless, the Stakeholders are the most restraining group.

The statements of the key actors are a good illustration of the relation between the perceptions or attitudes and sphere of action, which was explained above. But from all predications of the interviews can be concluded that the ECD's direction of the impact is principally clear to all persons involved. The main effort should be in avoiding a development of divergent interpretations of this impact.

Summary Efficiency

On Saturday, the process in general was perceived as efficient, fast and precise. The shift from table-group to plenary and the exchange of results usually worked well and was well organised. Despite the big amount of information and the number of overall involved persons, the design appeared to be extremely solid but was also flexible. The table design was regarded as essential for citizens' panels and nobody of the interviewed actors suggested any alternative to it. The exchange of dialogues in the Plenary is limiting by nature if such a number of persons is involved. Thus, the basic design was from the viewpoint of the interviewees more than acceptable. One question remained however. What was the source of Sunday's irritation?

On the one hand, the time problem was pointed out by those Table-Facilitators who needed consecutive language Interpreters. On the other hand, this issue was mentioned by Table-Facilitators regarding situations, when the discussion became to a slight extent confusing. Because of the narrow time frame the question is how to avoid the time problem. One possible solution could be to install two additional time buffers which could be transformed into breaks if they are not needed. Another solution would be to extend the time frame by

calculating more time for the exercises than is provided to the citizens officially. If the meeting proceeds regularly, some extra time can be gained. However, the time frame problem can not be ignored.

The service of the language Interpreters was perceived undoubtedly as highly efficient. The feedback system, the logistical support and also the multi-media support evoked very positive assessments. Less staff to support the process is perceived as a fatal miscalculation.

Summary Problems

The interviewed Facilitators clearly noticed differences regarding the quality of facilitation. Some Facilitators did not keep their table group under control or they had language problems, so that central messages and tasks were not delivered to the citizens correctly. On the one hand, this issue is related to the preparation of Facilitators mentioned below. But one can also raise the question, if it is useful to orientate the selection of the Facilitators on stronger criteria.

Another problem related to translation was directed towards the Theme-Team. Sometimes interpretations did not match with the output of the tables. The Theme-Team used other words than the citizens, what raised citizens' angriness. Stakeholders mentioned was not caused only by a mere translation problem. Maybe the problem occurred because important subtleties in relation to contextual or cultural semantics were not transferred between the languages, the stakeholders assumed. One solution could be to involve participants in the Theme-Team.

As mentioned above, the table design basically was assessed positive. One central question of the methodological design is how to transfer the results of a single table to the others. The predications in the interviews and also the results of the observation underpin that the transfer did not work completely. In this situation it is also important to take into consideration that the citizens assessed the process and the outcome positively in the final participants' polling. The citizens obviously did not perceive the straits of transfer as a fundamental

problem. But it might be useful especially for the methodological progress to reconsider the status, the responsibilities and the functions of the Theme-Team.

With regard to the preparation of the Facilitators it was outlined that the used top-down approach through the Steering Committee was not perceived positively. Aspects of critique were that the Facilitators had only a short time for preparation and were not involved from the beginning. On the whole, there was too much material to deal with. The Facilitators noted that this working conditions caused avoidable problems in the performance. Another problem was seen in the fact that the Steering Committee tolerated no suggestions for improvement and it did not give an insight into the real organisational structures to the Facilitators. The behaviour of some members of the Steering Committee and the relation to the Steering Committee were denoted as authoritarian.

The Facilitators themselves would not limit their area of responsibility to mediation and moderation. They describe themselves as key- and team-players who are able to take part in a structuring and instructive position. At least they felt as "people in the frontline" which were actually not involved in the decision making process. The interviewees reported a kind of "negative collective awareness" because of these overall conditions.

Therefore another important methodological question has to be raised. What kind of management and controlling is reasonable for such a process and which organisational structures should be formed? At this point, the solution can be proposed in a nutshell. More steering and simultaneously less steering!

In fact, the Meeting of Minds process has been structured and planned by the Steering Committee. More steering includes, that important decisions should be made by the persons in charge as early as possible. This should happen especially in consciousness of the fact that basic decisions can be controversially discussed with regard to the different methodological approaches within the Steering Committee. These processes of agreement finding can be highly time

intensive. Early decisions establish possibilities to inform and instruct all the people, who are carrying out the process, especially the Facilitators. This also offers opportunities to reflect on the process, to collect feedback and early decision making gives time to deal with the tasks in every sphere of action of the project. If decisions are made, they should be mediated clearly. The Steering Committee must be careful in changing its mind because every change has to be implemented. Therefore the Steering Committee has a clear mandate for self-control.

Not only the interviews but also the results of the observation indicate a clear difference between Facilitators in matters of qualification. It is the decision of the major persons in charge whether the qualities of the Facilitators should be benchmarked or not. This decision is related to the question on how standardized and reproducible the conditions of every table discussion and the whole process have to be.

This is not only a issue of knowledge and abilities which can be managed by information. Soft factors must be conveyed as well. That means to consider cultural learning, too. The Facilitators' "negative collective awareness" against the top-down management can be interpreted as not sufficiently culturally introduced to and guided through the process. "Culture" suggests the incorporation of the Facilitators and their involvement to the entire process instead of only instructing them on their specific tasks. Some Facilitators pointed out that they even had no idea of the rough organisational structures. The Facilitators have to be considered as central key players and partners of the process.

Especially in moments of "crisis" but also in terms of regular proceedings the cooperation between the Facilitators and the Rapporteurs worked well. But generally, the Facilitators noted that it would had been better to meet the other key players beforehand.

Less steering does not only include the openness to suggestions. The Facilitators referred to the problem of the large size of the Steering Committee which aggravates fast decision making. One solution can

be that situations should be accompanied by a special crisis commit-tee if fast and confidential decisions are necessary. Another addi-tional suggestion would be to install representatives of the citizens in the Steering Committee as well as the crisis committee. A formal par-ticipation of the citizens has not only a symbolical effect. It legiti-mates the decision making process. Critical situations like the Sunday "crisis" could be managed in a better mode because of a higher level of efficiency and shorter ways of communication.

The "voting exercise" (the "crisis" situation) on Sunday morning was perceived by some Facilitators as a normal procedure and an under-standable reaction with a positive effect. The moment when power shifted, as citizens articulated their unease with changing the number of Themes, was regarded as a considerable development. The choice of the citizens on the number of Themes has to be looked at through a citizen empowerment lens. Sunday morning provided the opportu-nity to have a true transformation and the whole process could have been designed differently - but to do so from the outside would have obstructed the deliberation process of the citizens'.

The infrastructural conditions of the first convention were assessed as well, in detail some smaller problems were detected. As mentioned above, the service of the language Interpreters, the feedback system, the logistical support and the multi-media support was described as efficient. Key actors mentioned that less supporting staff would have been counterproductive. It can be presumed that the high commit-ment of the citizens was a reaction to the high efforts of support. Be-side the direct facilitation methods, the commitment of the citizens was fostered by the efforts of the support on a symbolical level.

In the eyes of the Facilitators, the opportunity to contribute to the convention process was always provided and without any exception possible.

The problems presented by the Stakeholders are orientated towards basic questions of the design and methods of proceeding. One Stake-holder pointed out that the ECD-Process should be escorted by en-forced national discussions because of the limitations in experience

with the public debate on brain science on the European-level at the moment. This is an issue which has to be taken up later again. At the moment it can be stated that the design which has been used is worth to defend. In fact, one of the sources of ECD-Project is located on the national level, but the initial decision was to concentrate on European deliberation. To achieve this goal, the activities at national level are limited. One opportunity to increase the impact of Meeting of Minds at national level would be an adequate media strategy and presence.

Another Stakeholder mentioned with regard to the Themes and questions presented by the citizens that he sees a strong bias towards disease although brain science could provide a wider range of questions.

One Stakeholders argument was that the Meeting of Minds-Project started from the wrong point. Being uninformed, the citizens need in advance more information provided by scientists. The Facilitators described the citizens as well prepared. Several key actors appreciated the case study book as an excellent and important tool for preparation. Because of their high commitment, it can assumed that the citizens looked for information themselves. So the citizens were not uninformed. With this finding the key question is raised at which stage experts should be involved in the national respectively international process.

Some Stakeholders did not encounter any problems at all because the process had just started. So far it can be summarized that there are critical voices among the Stakeholders, but basically there is a more positive disposition which could be coined "wait and see". The majority of the Stakeholders appreciated that the ECD-Project strengthened the deliberation and consultation of laypersons. But the Stakeholders clearly named as an important outcome that citizens should make clear statements, which research targets ought to be chosen and which priority should be given to them.

In the view of some Stakeholders, future problems may occur in the preparation of a real "critical" synthesis of the results. In the area of different value systems additionally to different ethical approaches, some problems could arise in the field of brain science.

The King Baudouin Foundation was without exception described as a very professional coordinator and initiator of the ECD-Project. The key actors regarded the organisation as a energetic facilitator which has been objective, very cooperative and supportive.

Summary Identity

The key actors assessed the commitment of the citizens' as overwhelming and very enthusiastic. The participants were altogether very exited and curious. The most interviewees shared the opinion that the Convention and the ECD-Project can foster an European identity between the participating citizens.

It can be assumed, that this effect is caused by the fact that this group of citizens has the clear mandate to influence the European policy decision-making process. This can be a very motivating objective. As mentioned above with respect to the framing conditions of the Convention, all the efforts obviously intensified this effect. In accordance to the results of the observation it can be assumed that the citizens were very practically orientated on the tasks. The ECD-Framing supports the opportunity to concentrate on a special European task by working together across national boarders. Both, the task and the Convention-process were an opportunity to think in teams and in an European dimension. So the Convention helped to make the citizens sensitive – even physically – for the ongoing European process of which they became participants in a very active and practical sense.

Therefore, the Meeting of Minds and the first Convention process can be seen as an indication of a European communality and a common foundation that exists on the level of the citizens. This is definitely an evidence of the possibility of a real and intensive European teamwork of citizens. With regard to the results of the observation, the thinking in communal terms can be labelled as "natural".

For the most interviewed key actors it is still unclear what sort of impact Meeting of Minds could have on the European level. Therefore the question of what specific impact the ECD-Project will have

on the development of an European identity remains open to the key actors. To sum up the variances of opinion is a challenging undertaking. Grounded on the impression of the high commitment and enthusiasm of the citizens all interviewees agreed in the estimation that the ECD-Project can foster the development of an European identity. On the other hand, the key actors are cautious in their assessment of the final results of the entire process.

3.4   Observation - Methods and Proceeding

Two external evaluators attended the First Citizens' Convention. Every observer focused one table with citizens from several nations. This covered at least two complete courses of discussion. In agreement with Tinne Vandensande from the King Baudouin Foundation and the internal evaluator Alison Moore the external evaluation team focused table 1 and table 4.

The observation was conducted on Saturday and Sunday. The observers took the occasion to introduce themselves to the citizens at the welcome dinner on Friday evening. The table members were informed about the purpose and proceeding of the observation by the external evaluation team. The participants were invited to inquire details regarding the evaluators' task and were asked for their permission to be studied in the next two days, too.

The observers positioned themselves outside each table concerned, so that they could not cause any interference. Against the loud background noises, this distance sometimes made it very difficult to follow the discussions en detail.

As a help for observation, the external evaluators used a pre-structured observation tool. This means that the notes were taken on

specially prepared sheets that covered 15 minutes of observation time each. The content of this tool included the following dimensions:

Interaction
contains all descriptions regarding the communication and the interaction style of the citizens. For instance, it was noted if the table members did made their contributions reactively to their fellow table members or not.

Atmosphere
covers all impressions related to general conditions of the discussion. For instance, this dimension collected answers to questions on the existence of consent/dissent and relaxed/tense mood.

Language
frames questions on using popular language or distinguished, even scientific language. Another point of interest was the question of, whether the table members were able to discuss in the table's dominant language or if they needed to fall back into their mother tongue.

Roles
is an aspect which describes if and how single citizens or small citizens' groups of the table took special functions in the discussion process. It was observed, for example at table 1, that several citizens took over a leadership role.

Opinion
contains all notes orientated on the content of the discussion. It was definitely not the aim of the observation to depict the argument line of the table process. Observation targets on this dimension are descriptions of the type of an argument (cognitive, evaluative, normative).

Discussion
covers observations of the citizens' participation in the discussion. This dimension questioned, for example, if the table members followed the process or were absent; whether they were interested, committed or bored. Another point of interest was the ap-

pearance of questions and the scope of these questions.

Structure   is focused to all incidents which are related to the question how the table process was organized. This aspect concerns especially the external impact on a table and the influence of the Main-Facilitators. Here is also the place for documentations on how much and what kind of support a table received.

The measurement with the pre-structured tool was supported by several additional instruments. The dimensions of the pre-structured tool were explained in detail by a background sheet which helped to keep in mind and to check several aspects of the dimensions during the observation. Another instrument is based on this background sheet which is structured as a questionnaire. It can be used to summarise each day of the Convention. Beside the pre-structured tool, the observers took notes individually. It was possible to summarise and illustrate the discussion structure or the discussion process during the running procedure, for example. The table discussions and the Plenary Sessions were recorded on tape.

Because of the loud background noise this tool would not have been sufficient to stand alone in order to describe the process adequately but the tapes served the analysis during the reflection and recapitulation of the event afterwards.

3.5   Observation - Results

This section contains the results of the observation during the First Citizens' Convention. This report segment is based on 1.) the detailed descriptions by the pre-structured instrument which was used during the Convention 2.) the summarized notes concerning the entire con-

vention and 3.) notes, which were taken by the observers individually.

The following text illustrates the most important observations of the events on Saturday and Sunday. Each new process phase - Plenary or Table Session - is marked to give a better overview. The descriptions of the table sessions are reported separately for table 1 and table 4.

3.5.1   Structure of the Tables

Table 1

Nine citizens participated in the "international" table 1. 4 Danish people belonged to the group. Every other nation was represented by only one citizen (the Netherlands, Italy, Greece, Belgium – Flemish citizen, Germany). One woman changed seats with a woman from another table just before the Convention began. This measure prevented language problems.

The basic language of the table was English. Because of the high proportion of Danish citizens, the second language was Danish. One simultaneous Interpreter supported the communication. The ratio of men to women was almost balanced (4-5 counts). A broad range of people had been met on table 1 regarding the age (estimated) - from post adolescent (30 years) to older people (50 years and more). Alison Crowther (UK) facilitated the table in cooperation with Ida Anderson (Denmark), who supported the round as a Rapporteur.

Table 4

Table 4 had French and English as main languages and was facilitated by Michelle Seban (F). Michelle provided an English translation, too. The Interpreters' work was done by Jean-François Michel and the Rapporteurs were on Saturday Lisa Jamieson and on Sunday Jelena von Helldorff. The countries of origin were the United Kingdom (2

citizens), Belgium (1 Flemish / 1 French citizen), Greece (2 citizens) and Italy, France and Germany (1 citizen per country). As this table was a women's stronghold actually the gender ratio has been 6 women to 3 men. In the age-distribution 2 citizens were in the early-twenties, 3 in the late-twenties, 3 in the mid-thirties and 1 citizen was a retired person. The group altogether represented a socio-cultural mixture in school attainment (academics / non-academics, second and third level education) and in professions.

3.5.2   Description of the Processes on Saturday, June 4, 2005

A **Plenary Session** opened the process. The Main-Facilitator, Andrea Fischer, introduced and provided a short overview of the timetable of the day. Daniel Stone instructed in more detail, for example about some aspects which should be noted to support the Theme Team. He also set the timeframe for the next steps. The first task for the citizens was to formulate their hopes and expectations concerning the Convention.

At the Plenary and also in the following **start-up phase** of the table rounds, the citizens listened to the presented issues. After the main facilitation, the Table-Facilitator introduced and set the internal timeframe. At first, the citizens had to reflect on their hopes and expectations by themselves. After that, Alison instructed the citizens of the table to form 2 groups (English and Danish) in order to acquire at least 3 ideas by each group. Next, the working results were assessed in a discussion round of the entire table. In the beginning of this segment the Interpreter informed the citizens about the specifics of the translation process.

The citizens occupied a passive role during the Plenary and the start-up phase on the tables due to the process structure. The process and the presented content was followed very concentrated and the citi-

zens' were focused on their task during the working segments in the table round. The citizens were very motivated, concentrated and they kept a practical orientation towards their tasks during the entire Convention. Therefore the way of communication can be denoted as "natural".

The process, from the start until the end, was dominated by a very cooperative, communicative and also relaxed working atmosphere. As a result, an open dialogue between the group members was quickly established.

Table 1

After a short reading session of a paper which had been given to the citizens, the Facilitator separated the table into smaller subgroups for one first discussion round. The Danish subgroup fell into mother tongue and the other round communicated in English. Sometimes an extra-translation and discussion between the groups happened. The citizens used popular language. The observation now focused more on the English speaking group. Some leading roles became salient in this group for the first time. One participant started to occupy a substantial function within the process. But he did not behave dominantly or even suppressive, i.e. his activeness did not limit other citizens' possibilities to contribute. He inquired what the others think and everybody had possibilities to participate in the discussion. An open exchange of minds was quickly established. At the end, the results of the "sub-group discussions" were presented. The "informal leader" spoke for the focused group. This fact can be interpreted as an indicator for an accepted role taking. All comments were accepted. The process was interrupted by Daniel Stone because of the time limit. This confrontation with the time problem stressed out the Facilitator.

One additional stress factor was that some (technical) start-up problems occurred. The system of interpretation and the micros did not work well, but the support team reacted quickly. In fact, the tables'

support was well organized and efficient in general. The extreme surrounding by background noises was another problem that complicated the table discussion and the observation. Thus the micro-system was up to now partly used for "normal" communication by the Facilitator.

After this time segment, the group photo was taken.

Table 4

The first round dealt with hopes and expectations and the table-members were asked to express themselves individually. With the exception of one French and one Greek everybody understood the remarks of the English citizens. The Interpreter was highly directed to one English citizen, while the Facilitator assisted in transmitting the overall content.

The exchange of views was very intensive all the time. The citizens argued thematically specific but not scientific. This means, the pro-tagonists truly spoke from ones' own experience with the other table members. A source for the citizens' contributions consisted in their political, societal and ethical views on the issues of brain science. This strongly intensified their enthusiasm to participate. As the exchange of opinions tended to become more influenced by political issues the table members became slightly more sophisticated. But the communication did not went beyond the scope of the exchange of hopes and expectations. Furthermore it was quite observable, that the development of roughly two differing groups consisting of the two Britons and one Belgian became more virulent. The Facilitator guided through the discussion process by collecting the individuals' statements and the picture gradually became clear. As time runs out the collected statements were reassured and transmitted to the Theme Team.

In regard to the conducted interviews with key actors of the ECD-Project, some anticipations were expressed that especially citizens

from southern Europe rely on a more "conservative" value system. A first result of the observation is, that these anticipations can't be confirmed. In opposite to that, the citizens of southern European countries presented "liberal" views, less influenced by religious values.

The Theme Team summarised and reported the results during the next **Plenary Session**. The citizens were asked to join some keypad-polling on basic brain related questions ("trivia" knowledge questions). After the presentation of the identified hopes and expectations the preparation for the first discussion round concerning one special pre-selected subject (case) per table began. The Main-Facilitator, Andrea Fischer, introduces all cases. A worksheet was handed out to the tables, but there were not enough copies of them. Seen as just a little incidence, this did not negatively influence the ongoing table process in general because of the fast and adequate reaction of the well organised support team. At least, it has to be remarked that copies of these worksheets were mostly not handed out to the observers, sometimes after enquiring for them.

Table 1

For the **first discussion round** the case of table 1 was ADHD. The Table-Facilitator initiated the discussion round on table. Everybody was asked to read the worksheets and to formulate one idea. Following to that, an open discussion with the purpose of collecting the ideas was introduced.

Oblique to the observation the statement of principle can be formulated, that the guidance qualities of the Facilitators do have a profound impact on the discussion process and therefore also on the results. Alison Crowther can be characterized as a "Strong-Leadership-Facilitator". This means in case of table 1: The Facilitator structured the process in a intensive scale. This applied the group structure as well as the structure of interaction patterns. Beside this direction of the process she had longer portions of speech when she

summarized the acquired issues. One might say, she leads to results in a more intensive way. Alison also repeated, emphasised and confirmed the ideas given by the citizens. This kind of facilitating could be denoted as "teaching facilitation", because of the special communication structure.

This strategy can quickly gain results. But there is a risk of a preselection of the results by the Facilitator, especially if the citizens are restrained. In the case of table 1, the strong leadership of the Facilitator had no such negative outcome. Alison Crowther was very concentrated and assured herself to understand the citizens, for example by inquiring further details of citizens' thoughts. The Facilitator asked also for confirmation when she repeated the core of meaning. But this case leads to the more general question, what kind of leadership is necessary and also which standardizations are sensible to secure comparable results, especially concerning the expectations of the Steering Committee.

The "informal leader" of the last table round and another male participant were active and took over the ice-breaker roles after a phase of concentrated reading of the worksheets. The whole table was committed and idea after idea was presented. The translation set, as a technical gadget, worked well now, but the Facilitator encouraged to speak in English. This "English push" was successful. The support of the translator was very important but this last finding is an indicator, that the language issue is not only influenced by knowledge components.

The dialogue was very communicative. Sometimes, it was very difficult to follow the structure of argumentation because of the loud background noise. But it can be summed up that the given arguments consisted in a mixture of cognitive and emotional opinions. For example, it was discussed that it is complicated and takes much time to identify ADHD. Fears became a main topic, for instance in regard to an early medication when ADHD is not clearly identified. There were raised some questions which required specialist knowledge and concepts like what are the long term effects of Ritalin. It was noticed by

the citizens that this question can not be answered because of the lack of scientific expertise at this moment.

Every citizen on table participated intensely in the table discussion. At the beginning of the discussion the process was influenced by the informal "leading person", who took over again an active role as the "questioner". He inquired the position of the group and of each person. But also two Danish woman became salient. Because of the very relaxed atmosphere and the highly agreement at the table, the discussion is more to understand as the process of construction. Someone threw in the first idea and the other group members formulated additions to that. Most of the time Alison lead the communication and interaction. She encouraged to make the results visible and summarized the results. The strong table facilitation gained results quickly, because after the summary of Alison the citizens had only to confirm or not. The citizens, who worked very committed, made a lot of comments and inquiries. Some citizens checked the table notes at the end of the discussion. Not only by this finding, the impression was given that not all of the Themes and notes were completely clear to all table members. During the last part of the table discussion, the leadership role taking, which is described above, disappeared. At the end, all citizens had equal communicative positions. As Daniel Stone closed the discussion phase not all aspects were recorded in the Rapporteur notes. Alison and some citizens supported Ida Andersen completing the file.

Table 4

The table's task has been to identify up to 5 questions on the assigned case: brain surgery. Different from the first round, this assignment led to a withdraw of some citizens. For that reason the Facilitator encouraged everyone to participate but brain surgery could not catch everybody at all. Furthermore a little dispute between the Britons, the Belgian and one French citizen manifested on a normative anticipated point of view.

Technically the consecutive translation was very worth the effort in supporting the exchange of arguments, which fostered the entire discursive process. The Facilitator moderated the discussion strictly with the intention of achieving and collecting the demanded five questions. The Facilitator delegated the discussion from the table's plenary into the language groups, before fractionising at the table began and a risk of a dispute established. This delegation had a constructive impact on concentrating the citizens to their task. After five minute intervals, the language groups had to present their findings to the complete table. This helped to increase the communication between the citizens across their native language groups again and the little conflict from the beginning of this session vanished completely. Moreover, the less interested citizens had been reactivated as well. By collecting the group results, the more affected leading members of the English and the Belgian group oriented themselves to a co-moderating role in accordance with the Facilitator. Seven completely formulated and usable questions were collected at flip-chart and further on, this method allowed the table as a group to centre the main findings in a highly constructive mode.

By contrast to the observation at table 1 the point of leadership has not been as prominent as at table 4. No such "informal leadership-role" with an effect onto the entire group was took over by the English or Belgian protagonists individually. Moreover, a very special feature of table 4 has to be seen in the formation of fractions around individual protagonists therefore the first discussion round at the table was dominated by this clustering of arguments.

The Facilitator successfully guided the opinion-forming process from the language groups back to the table group by simultaneously allowing certain individuals to present their own ideas profoundly. The Facilitator's strategy to shift the contextual discussion back into language groups when certain dispute situations occurred and to shift it back again to the entire table did help to achieve the overall task to collect up to 5 new questions on the assigned case. The re-

alignment of the citizens to the whole group process is highly dependent from the Facilitator's abilities in moderating and mediating those processes in the desired direction. It is imaginable that the participants can be trapped in their native language groups, that means, that they can intend to rely on communication processes inside their own language groups instead of re-orientating themselves to the individual point of view again. These individual points of view ought to be gathered and transmitted to the table.

In the following **plenary session** the extracted Themes were presented by the Main-Facilitator Andrea Fischer. An introduction to the second round of table discussions was also given.

Table 1

In the beginning of the **second discussion round** the Facilitator introduced the next tasks and the table group listened to her explanations attentively. Next, a handout was given to the table members. A question, that had to be answered, was, who of the citizens should present the results of the table in the next Plenary Session. The subject of this discussion was Alzheimer disease.

The citizens reflected on the task, the Themes and the case for a couple of minutes by themselves. Every citizen participated in the following discussion. But in comparison with the end of the last case discussion, the interactions and the collection of ideas proceeded less impulsively. The citizens were restrained at the start time. Step by step the table group came to terms with the subject. Again, one Danish woman made a meaningful and important statement, but this round was dominated by forming questions and looking for answers. The "informal leader", his fellow and Ida Andersen proposed some knowledge based answers. But the table needed more detailed information's on Alzheimer disease.

The process ran more fluidly after some minutes of discussion. The support of the language interpreter was very helpful and important in this round, because of some citizens did not find the correct terms.

The citizens supported each other to formulate their statements. This emphasises the findings in regard to the group-forming process mentioned above. Another indicator for the growing solidity of the table group was, that sometimes citizens themselves took a very short break from the table interactions to discuss a special aspect in a smaller group. These actions supported the hole process, because statements, argument lines and agreements of the smaller group were gained quickly and brought in the table process. This finding is also an indicator of the open working atmosphere, which existed during the entire Convention. This positive group effects improved also the "building" process of results. A true team identity established on the table and the individual group member strongly agreed with the outcome. This pushed the commitment of the participants further. The Facilitator was very satisfied with the group performance (statement to observer).

The Rapporteur Ida Andersen became an active institution of the table process. She asked questions and intervened during she took the notes for the Theme Team.

The Facilitation of Alison Crowther became softer in this discussion. She had to reject a suggestion of the citizens to separate the group in subgroups because of the narrow time frame. But, the summarizing of the results became less "frontal". The discussion process finished in time.

Table 4

The new task of table 4 was to identify European Themes from the second case study (reading the brain). Every single citizen was invited to write some Themes down on cards.

The Facilitator stressed, that the basic exercise for the table is to evolve thinking in an European context now. After the phase of collecting ideas had finished, a discussion started that was influenced in content by one of the citizens. The cards were pinned at a flip chart. Thus, everyone could follow the process of developing a "core-

structure" in convergence with the different positions. The case was discussed in a highly normative and political sense as the specific topics did show: military usage of brain reading, counter-intelligence, brain reading in captivity and the impact of economy in matters of advertisement… Nevertheless two of the citizens were not able to follow the whole process that the Facilitator suggested to practise a kind of lip-reading in order to catch all words. In addition the group was instructed to speak more slowly. With one exception, table 4 citizens' did not have any difficulties in using French as the table's basic language principally. But one table member needed the whole attention of the consecutive Interpreter, that he was bounded to this task. It appeared, that one single consecutive translator sometimes was not able to assist people from 5 different language groups. So the Facilitator herself structured the opinion cards again and by doing so she incorporated the whole table. The atmosphere now was highly influenced by a shared teamwork identity with the aim of finding profound European Themes on the case "reading the brain". The Facilitator in cooperation with all table members summed up the results. Despite the fact that the case was interpreted strongly by political, societal and normative aspects, an agreement was developed. The view of the Britons did slightly differ of those from the continent but this was discussed as a cultural side-effect by the table in a very self-reflecting and objective manner. Therefore, the consensus-orientation of the table members should be mentioned particularly.

To sum it up, at first the process of decision-making had been an individual one. In presenting the results, one citizens positioned himself as a kind of leading person in opinion making. His thoughts were incorporated by the whole table and progressively developed in orientation to the table's duty. Finally, the participants interacted communicatively, attributable to their personal beliefs and opinions. As mentioned above, the possible cultural bias of the British was eliminated by giving prominence to it. At last, the table members agreed to transfer the task of presenting the results in the plenary discussion to the most input-spending citizen.

The next **Plenary Session** was introduced by Andrea Fischer. The results of the table discussions were reported to the forum by one delegate of each table. For table 1 the "informal leader" was speaking and for table 4 the most input-spending citizen. This underpins the reported findings concerning the acceptance of the leadership role respectively the trust, the table members had have in the most communicative and interacting persons for both tables.

Table 1

The next task for the table discussion was to find common Themes between the two cases, which were focused in the two discussion phases before.

The **cross case table discussion** stood in the tradition of the last discussion sessions. The citizens were very cooperative, their commitment was high and the interactions were oriented on discourse. All citizens seriously perceived themselves as the fundament of the discussion. Nevertheless, a relaxed working atmosphere expanded without over-sizing this role. The citizens had fun to participate. The formerly described process of building of the results secured a high agreement between the citizens. But when the discussion started, the participants needed time to come to terms with the subject. A table discussion process had to be organised and initiated every time when a new discussion segment began. The discussion process was no gift.

In the beginning of the table round, the citizens got a short time to find some ideas by themselves. In this phase, some people congregated and formed small groups by themselves to reflect together.

No individual single role takers were observed at the starting point of the table discussion. All citizen shared the same positions within the structure of interaction. The process ran slow, there were short communication gaps. This was obviously a contrast to the end of the last session of discussion. Step by step the discussion process became more vital as it was observed the rounds before.

The Facilitator's management must be described as strict. Regarding the facilitation technique, one special aspect became salient in this segment, which was indicated above as the "teaching modus". Beside the usual features of this facilitation approach, that don't have to be described again, the main interaction-structure respectively communication-structure was: the question posed by the Facilitator – the answer given by the citizen.

Because of the "time out" commando by Daniel Stone, there was not much time to assess the acquired aspects. The round did nit finish completely. The Rapporteur Ida Andersen inquired details of statements in the aftermath of the session.

Table 4

With the next effort to develop new cross-case questions out of the first two case studies, table 4 started to work in three groups, mostly around language clusters. Some little exchange between the groups took place, but the method was more oriented towards in-group paper work. The Facilitator made statements in order to structure the discussion by "visiting" every group consisting of three citizens. That did not happen in a manipulative manner at all. The discussion, that expanded in presenting the results, was very political and normative as during the two discussed cases happened to be before. Both cases had a strong normative influence but were treated in a very rational way. There was no "alpha"-person, but some inputs can clearly be assigned to the Belgium and British citizens.

Interactively, up to 5 citizens "monopolized" the discussion then, whereas the rest stayed more observant. In this, the discussion concentrates on "normalcy" and aspects which were related to this topic. "Normalcy" was hotly disputed but the citizens found a way to communicate discursively.

The following "Kooshball" activity was a very welcome change of activities for the citizens. Especially the members of table 1, as far

observed, participated enthusiastic, had a great time and acted as a team. In the **Plenary Session**, the dialog about the cross case themes, which were gained at the tables, was extended to the forum for further exploration and assessment. The topics were explained by the citizens themselves. So, everybody had the opportunity to make a comment to every issue. At the commence, this course of action ran more slowly but the shyness of the participants decreased rapidly. The comments of other citizens as well as the summaries of the Main-Facilitator Daniel Stone were reflected and assessed very lively. For instance, a woman of table 1 commented and criticised Daniel Stone's interpretation. This women was personally involved in formulating the Theme during the table group discussion and therefore strongly related to this issue. She demanded an improvement of Daniel Stone's interpretations. She played a salient active role in this Plenary discussion. It can be noted that the Plenary for the first time became an agora, a place, where arguments and opinions could had been exchanged across the "table boarders". In this agora the participants found an open atmosphere to discuss and to shape the results, and the citizens took the possibility to interfere whenever it seemed to be necessary for them.

Because of the proceeding to assess the outcome of the tables again in an overall discussion in form of the agora, it can be assumed that the final results of the day reflect the intentions and the attitudes of the participants.

A lot of comments concerning special aspects of the Themes were made in this Plenary Session, for example regarding the "religion-issue". So, a broad spectrum of deep elaborated Themes was gained. In this last phase, some technical problems concerning the translation headset system occurred. After the dialog, Daniel Stone summarised the results and presented the new Themes which were developed by the Plenary. Andrea Fischer introduced the national meetings.

The task of the **National Meetings** was to summarise and to assess the experiences of the first day. Each national round had to choose

one representative for presenting the most important aspects of the national evaluation in the next Plenary Session, but also in the public Plenary Session on Sunday.

In the German group, each member reported about the Convention from his or her point of view. Basically, the judgement was positive, but there were also some suggestions. The most important were presented in the Plenary Session after this meeting.

In the English national group everyone contributed to the discussion very self-reflective as, for instance, one of the citizens' asked if it is cumbersome to the British to follow up a matter that is more important to other fellow countrymen. Another participant mentioned that the difference between "religiousness" and "spirituality" seems to be very subjective and strongly related to national (cultural) backgrounds as it was observable in the previous Plenary.

"How did we participate until now?" and "How can we estimate the misunderstandings due to the cultural/individual bias?" – were the final questions the British national panel discussed in the meeting.

In the last **Plenary Session** of this day, the delegates of the national groups presented the feedback of their group. A presented methodological issue was, that some summaries did not match the ideas of the tables. An example for that was mentioned above. A lot of speakers emphasized that it was a wonderful experience to discuss "without borderlines" and with such an ease and to find out that the nations have a common base. This base was called: the European identity.

The citizens criticized the narrow time frame for some tasks. Also the noise around the tables was not perceived as supportive. The technical problems, especially related to the performance of the translation, were another issue. Also more transparency and more precise information were demanded by the citizens.

At the end, a keypad polling was conducted for collecting the participants' feedback regarding the first day of the Conventions. The first discussion day was closed by Gerrit Rauws. He invited the citizens to visit the archaeological site of the old palace of Brussels at Coudenberg and to participate in the dinner afterwards.

3.5.3   Description of the processes on Sunday, June 5, 2005

At table 1 and 4, the same participants met as on the previous day. The process was initiated by a **Plenary Session**. Daniel Stone introduced and explained the meaning of each of the 17 Themes, which were acquired the day before. Andrea Fischer provided the first task to prioritize the Themes.

Table 1

The members of the table had to decide to reflect either about the Themes individually or together with other citizens in a group. The citizens formed small groups. The participants worked carefully, but they also found the same relaxed working atmosphere as on the day before. In the English subgroup, the "informal leader" showed great interest and asked the group for its assessment. Alison Crowther helped the participants. The interactions between the citizens happened in a cooperative and a communicative manner. The table members used everyday-language. Beside English sometimes Danish and sometimes German were spoken. The citizens commented in between that there was a lot of material to handle.

Table 4

When the table group came together in the next morning it was noticeable that the mutual cultural activities after the First Convention meeting had a community-building effect on the members of the table. Social connectedness in the sense of bridging social capital refers to networks, in which people are "doing with" (Putnam 2000: 116) each other instead "doing for" (ibid.), as the American political scientist Robert D. Putnam pointed out in "Bowling Alone" (ibid.). A process of building a "team-identity" was observed at table 1 as well.

After the Facilitator explained the first task at this morning, the citizens' developed dialogical interactions beyond the language barriers. Starting to work in smaller units was a change to the experiences on the day before.

Thematically the groups discussed the case of economical pressure and interests on brain science. The Facilitator assisted the groups to formulate central case-specific questions for the presentation to the Plenary afterwards.

The aim of the next **Plenary Session** was to select the most important Themes by keypad polling. The results were presented immediately. From this time segment, the whole process was in danger to topple. The major process began to run less smooth and less convergent than before. A lot of small processes took place separated from the core process. Therefore, only the most considerable impressions were documented. At first, it was observed that one woman of table 1 obviously didn't understand the polling rules and the keypad mechanism. This confirmed other observation impressions that a few citizens were not confident with the keypad polling processes, especially during the Theme voting.

Apart from these details, a bigger problem aroused. The citizens became increasingly insecure and restrained. From a task-orientation, their attention was focused now on the process itself. One reason for that can be seen in the fact, that the targeted objective seemed to be

more and more unclear to the citizens, because of different, sometimes opposing instructions by the Main-Facilitators. Basically, the changing of the number of the expected Themes created an atmosphere of uncertainty for every person involved. Daniel Stone set a new timeframe for a short table discussion for assessing the list of Themes.

Table 1

The entire processes wasn't consolidated by this **new tables discussion round**. The citizens started to work to assess the Themes again. The cooperative mode of the dialogue didn't change, but the relaxed atmosphere was rarely kept up. Some citizens commented that the plenary process proceeded too fast to follow. The targeted objectives seemed not to be transparent enough to the participants and they became gradually insecure.

Principally, all of the citizens showed high commitment over all, but in this situation, some participants at other tables separated themselves from their table to discuss with others in the "neighbourhood". This observation can be interpreted as a separation from the Theme discussion.

The behaviour was showed also by some members of the table 1, who normally were very active within the round. Even the "informal leader" had short time-outs. The reflection about the findings and the processes obviously was a strategy of coping with the ambiguous situation. One special indicator for the separation process can be seen in the use of mother languages. For instance, the "informal leader" spoke in German with his fellow.

The citizens had the same role perception that they had during the entire process. They tried to keep to stay in line with the process and face the task. On the other hand the participants "separated" themselves from the table discussions by changing the content of communication into completely other directions. For instance, the conversa-

tions were focused on individual issues like the expression of feelings regarding the situation.

The table process collapsed, what was a question of missing transparency and a loss of orientation. The comments of the table members show, the main problem for the citizens was the uncertainty regarding the expected tasks. In addition, the question increasingly arose, why to achieve this tasks in the way of the organizers. It can be interpreted as an indicator for the toppling of the process that issues of legitimisation became the subject of communication.

On the other hand the citizens continued in showing high commitment. After a short time-out they returned to the table discussion. There was no real obstructive behaviour. Therefore the situation was critical but not hopeless. Gerrit Rauws **stopped** the entire process at this moment. He requested a break to convene a meeting of the Steering Committee which was confirmed by the participants.

The **Steering Committee** met to manage the "crisis". The question was posed, how to rebuild the dialog. Because the time elapsed, it was important to offer a clear direction to the citizens how to proceed further on. Two solutions were worked out in a concentrated but short debate. These solutions were presented to the citizens and the citizens had to decide which of these they prefer.

Gerrit Rauws presented the two options in the **Plenary**. He became the central person to calm down the process. He mediated certainty and other informal resources to the citizens, which made it possible to continue.

A short **table discussion** prepared the voting between the two suggested solutions. In spite of their frustration, the citizens showed high commitment. At table 1, the "informal leader" took over again a leading role in the dialog. At table 4, the citizens debated in open discourse. The entire process normalized gradually.

In a following **Plenary Session** the voting result of the two Theme constellations was almost balanced, but the proposed structure with top 6 Themes was preferred by a majority of citizens. In the next step, the participants were instructed to identify a central question and if necessary some sub-questions for the national assessments, regarding one of the selected top 6 Themes. The theme of table 1 was ADHD and of table 4 "pressure from economy".

Table 1

In the **discussion round of table 1** the Table-Facilitator structured the seating plan of the round, built up three smaller subgroups and instructed the citizens more detailed. The first task for the next minutes was to collect key terms for a flip chart presentation. The citizens worked orientated towards their task as in the successful segments before. The surrounding noise made it difficult at times to listen and to discuss. Not all citizens seemed to have a good view on the flip chart. The central languages were English and Danish. The Table-facilitator was very committed to keep the process running.

After a few minutes, the Facilitator took the key terms and interpreted them together with the citizens. Gradually a cooperative dialogue arose in the accustomed pattern. The Facilitator was incisive and demanding and she followed her strategy of a strict leadership. She went into a very concentrated dialogue with the citizens. Alison Crowther always assured herself the confirmation of the citizens and the citizens were able to make suggestions. One Danish woman, for example, wanted to group the key terms, which was realised. The "informal leader" actively presented some questions and terms. The Rapporteur often inquired facts regarding the notes and supported the citizens regarding the understanding of terms. Alison was under stress because the time elapsed, but Daniel Stone added 20 minutes. This was appreciated by all persons involved.

Some citizens changed their position at the table to get a better view on the flip chart and the "informal leader" visited other citizens of the

table for a small discussion – sometimes also related to other subjects than the Themes and questions. Together with his fellow he noticed that "there is too much material" collected. On the one hand, these observation-impressions underpin the can be interpreted as a kind of collective reflection. The citizens were highly committed, but some citizens took a small break and went to the toilet. This can be seen as a sign of breaking up. Maybe this time-outs only resulted from the fact, that the discussion processes continued too long. The citizens came back quickly. On the other hand a lot of indicators illustrated the revitalisation of the process.

The collection of contributed ideas filled the flip chart and even the citizens pleaded for limiting and concentrating on the main factors. As Daniel Stone closed the session, the exercise was not totally finished. Two Danish woman completed the notes together with the Rapporteur and other table members.

Table 4

Without changing the location, the table members remained in the Plenary room to identify a central question and additional sub-questions as demanded. Therefore the working conditions must be described as suboptimal in regard to the surrounding noise. Initial debates were hold in little subgroups beyond any "national" structures, e.g. one Briton joined the French/Belgian group escorted by the consecutive translator. Nevertheless, it was quite observable that different perceptions existed as it was highlighted before, that the table concentrated its deliberation on normative and political aspects. The Facilitator visited these subgroups in order to reflect and to translate the former situation of "crisis". This seemed to be unproblematic so that the groups concentrated on achieving results. These results were introduced to the entire table in the next step. The exchange of outcomes was efficient. Everyone was able to add comments. The Facilitator and the Rapporteur guided through the process. The Rapporteur became more prominent by a certain extend without dominating the situation. She acted supportive to the Facili-

tator in a content driven mode. All participants of the table as well as the moderating and mediating key players oriented themselves to the demanded task. No cards or flipchart were needed to formulate the questions and sub-questions. The group acted collectively in dictating whole sentences with assistance of the Facilitator to the Rapporteur. The results were directly transmitted to the Theme Team. Acting as an collective satisfied the members of the table. A feeling of pride and identification with the outcome expanded among the individuals.

The **finishing session** was introduced by Daniel Stone, who gave some explanations regarding the next steps of the Convention. After the break one citizen of each table presented the group results to the Plenary. This happened without any problems, not at least because of the good support of the language interpreters. The polling via keypad provided data about the acceptance of the final questions. A short but intensive table group discussion followed. The citizens of table 1 formed groups again. The discussion pattern stood along with the tradition of the other successful process phases. The polling result of the Plenary regarding the quality of questions was very solid.

A short table discussion respectively time for personal reflection about the assessment of the Convention was installed next to the polling. The following voting concerning the satisfaction of the participants and the assessment of the importance of work collected very affirmative assessments.

The final event of the Convention consisted in the presentation of the results to a broader public. The audience included journalists, decision-makers, policy-makers and Stakeholders, etc.. One citizen from every table reported in a short statement on one special aspect. The citizens and the broader public were enabled to comment on these statements. An affirmation to Europe and the European identity by the citizens was clearly detected by the observers. The Main-Facilitators thanked their team members and said goodbye and Gerrit

Rauws closed the Plenary. Each person who participated in the Convention in any kind was named personally. The final passage with this personal note was applauded by the citizens. The warmly good-bye of the members of the observed tables was very emotional and expressed a special kind of table identity.

3.6   Observation Summary and Conclusions

The process started very well and continued smoothly on Saturday. The citizens were assisted and instructed in a meaningful mode what created an easy way to enter in the dialog and provided orientation throughout the process. The preparation of the participants must be called excellent. The instructions provided also an cultural orientation in treating one another to the citizens. Due to the preparation and the actually made efforts during the Convention, the event on Saturday proceeded in a positive way.

The "training" segment, focused on hopes and expectations, provided the spin off to detect possible sources of friction in advance without disturbing the dialog. A stress factor in the start-up phase can be seen in the occurrence of technical problems, e.g. with the interpreters' devices. But the support of the tables was efficient and well organized, that these problems were quickly solved. The organizers created good framing conditions for the citizens and for the overall discussion process.

As a result, the participants were able to concentrate on their tasks and they did that with considerable enthusiasm. The citizens worked motivated and kept this orientation towards the tasks during the entire Convention. Most of the participants noticeably entered the process with a very practical understanding of the discourse and faced the situation in that manner. This kind and scale of interaction

and communication established "naturally". This can be seen as one important reason for quickly overcoming national boarders and developing an open dialogue with a real exchange of minds. Table 1 can be quoted as an example for this finding. In other cases it needed some time to expand fully discursive structures as observed at table 4.

The process principally has been dominated by a very cooperative, communicative, consensus-orientated and also relaxed working atmosphere. This finding can be explained by the fact that the citizens had the opportunity to meet the other members of their table during the dinner on Friday, one day before the dialog started. Therefore the question "What is our identity in this process" was answered in advance. The event on Friday definitely supported the formation of a table-group-identity and influenced positively the entire process. The positive atmosphere of the event based to a large extent on this important and essential aspect of groundwork.

Nevertheless, after the discussion of a new topic started the citizens needed some time to come to terms with the new discourse situation. Because of the fact the citizens were restrained in the starting phase, a table discussion process had to be produced every time when a new discussion segment began. The discussion process was not a given. A basic conclusion regarding methodological aspects is that segments of discussion should not be subdivided into too small units. The design of the First Citizens' Convention met this feature.

At table 1 and 4 it could have been observed that some participants at times took over leading roles within the interaction. At least one person at every table can be labelled as an "informal leader". The other participants contributed to the table process in a salient scale, too. This taking of a leading role had a positive influence to the open exchange of minds at the tables without any exceptions. The "leader's" activity did not limit the opportunities to participate in the discourse for the fellow members of the table.

The "informal table leaders" were explicitly chosen by the groups to represent the table. This citizens presented, for instance, the outcome

of the table in the Plenary Sessions. It is possible to list other observations details, which underline the conclusion that this kind of role taking was socially accepted. Acting in such a role should not be obstructed when it carries these features.

But differences between the two focused tables did also exist. Whereas the described characteristics of a cooperative, communicative and also relaxed working atmosphere clearly were valid for table 1, sometimes more friction existed between the members of table 4. This was reasoned by the development of two roughly differing factions of citizens who differed in attitudes and concepts. The Facilitator had to react to this group dynamism and separated the factions by dividing the table round into national sub-groups.

The conflict situation was resolved and the process gradually continued in a more discursive way. As the table members of table 4 came together on Sunday, it was noticeable that the mutual spare time activities after the Saturday's meeting principally had a community-building effect on the citizens. The atmosphere of the Convention can basically be labelled as cooperative and communicative.

The discussion process at table 1 can be understood as a process of construction. After the contribution of the first idea by one table member, the others add their perspective. This happened in a basically relaxed working atmosphere with a high level of agreement combined with high solidarity between the table members during the entire Convention. This type of interaction is compatible with the style of strong leadership by the Facilitator.

One major finding of the observation was that the Facilitator's approach of leadership influenced deeply the discussion process and therefore also the results. Furthermore the claim by some key actors in the interviews was supported by the observation results. The observation detected a difference regarding the Facilitators "qualities". This included not only differences related to mere abilities like linguistic competences.

The issue of the Facilitators' quality is a question of, which mental models a Facilitator has about his or her work and which problem solving strategies he or she uses. It is a question of perception, thinking, behaviour and practice. The style of facilitating can not be seen as a constant, but the Facilitator of table 1 can be characterised as a "Strong-leadership-facilitator". This means she strongly structured the table process what includes the structuring of the group as well as the structuring of the interaction and the communication. One aspect of this strong facilitation style additionally became salient and was labelled the "teaching modus". The interaction and communication was structured in question and answer mode.

Such a mode of facilitation can quickly lead to results. But there is also a risk of a pre-selection of results, especially if the citizens are restrained. Another outcome of this situation can be that the discussion process overruns some citizens. In the case of table 1 the strong leadership style of the Facilitator had no negative effect. The Facilitator was very concentrated towards the contributions of the citizens and assured herself to understand the contents, for example by inquiring further details. She requested the confirmation of the citizens regarding her interpretations.

The realignment of the members of table 4 to the whole group process was highly dependent on the Facilitator's abilities to moderate and mediate these processes in the desired direction. It might have been possible that the participants could be trapped in their native language groups in this situation. But this did not happen.

These cases lead to the more general question what styles of leadership are necessary and meaningful and also which standardizations are sensible to secure comparable results, especially concerning the expectations of the Steering Committee. Attention should also be given to the aspect which proportions of speech the Facilitator, respectively the citizens, should have in the dialog.

The citizens used everyday language. The support of the translators was very important, especially on the international tables. Nevertheless some observations show that communication and understanding

is a question of goodwill of the citizens, too. After the Facilitator encouraged the table members to communicate in English, they did, although they claimed beforehand not to speak English. Another finding is worth to remark in this context. The mutual assistance of citizens in order to formulate the statements increased the solidarity level and provided group cohesion. But this observation is definitely not to be understood as an argument against translation support.

Depending on the situation it seems to be a fact that one single consecutive Interpreter sometimes can not assist people from 5 different language groups sufficiently, if at least one table member needs translation support permanently. This was the case at table 4. But the high afforded translation support generally paid out. The decision to employ lesser staff or efforts in this basic design should be well-considered.

The citizens sometimes used specific concepts related to brain science, but the exchange of arguments was not scientific. The protagonists truly spoke from their own experience or they argued from a political, societal respectively ethical perspective. On table 1 at times more questions than answers or arguments arose, especially in relation to the discussion of the two cases. The citizens commented that they were not able making a final statement because of their lack of knowledge regarding this aspect. For example, one of this questions was, which effects are produced by a long-term medication of Ritalin.

This observation can be counted as an argument for the involvement of experts into the First-Convention-Design. The answers of experts towards special knowledge questions of the citizens could facilitate more detailed decisions within the table discussion process. The question remained whether the national assessments dealt with all open questions of the citizens.

One subject of the case-discussion on table 4 (brain surgery) led to a withdrawal of some citizens. For that reason, the Facilitator encouraged everyone to participate but the topic brain surgery caught not the attention of each table member.

As mentioned above, the citizens were basically highly committed and they had the possibility to contribute not only in the table rounds. The Plenary Session produced opportunities to assess and explore the results of the table discussions directly together with all participants, even if the size of the Plenary limited the overall number of contributions.

The citizens needed time to come to terms with the Plenary Discussion like with the other dialog phases as well. But, the restraints of the citizens decreased rapidly. One major problem of the discussion process, which was "officially" mentioned by the citizens after the national panel meetings, was the fact, that the interpretations and terms of the Theme Team did not match the concepts of the citizens. The Plenary constituted the possibility for the correction and examination of misinterpretations and concepts. The citizens participated actively and found an open atmosphere for discussing and developing the results. The citizens used possibilities of intervention, so that that the working results generally reflect the intentions and the sensitivities of the participants.

Another indicator for the high commitment of the citizens was, that a lot of comments were added during the Plenary Sessions concerning special aspects of issues. The outcome of the dialog consisted of a broad spectrum of deep elaborated Themes.

After the national meetings, the citizens presented aspects of critique, which concur with the overall results of the observation. Beside the problem concerning the misinterpretation of citizens' concepts by the Theme Team or the Main-Facilitators, the major issue was the narrow timeframe. The observation, especially of table 1, documented a few table discussions which were not completed in time. This finding concurred clearly with the statements of the interviewed key actors. The time problem especially appeared at international tables, which required higher efforts of translation.

The extreme surrounding loudness by background noises didn't find positive assessments. Sometimes, it was really difficult to follow the table discussion. Another point of critic was focused towards the

quantity of material, which was to handle by the citizens. Beside the fact, that some technical problems occurred, the citizens demanded more transparency and more precise information.

The most critical segment of the entire process started in one of the first time segments on Sunday as the whole discussion process began to topple. The major problem consisted in the fact, that the citizens became increasingly insecure and restrained because the targets of the process became gradually in-transparent. Basically, the changing of the number of expected Themes created an atmosphere of uncertainty and a lack of transparency. After a break and a short meeting of the Steering Committee, the situation was cleared by a voting of citizens The Steering Committee suggested two options. The voting created the basis to proceed. Gerrit Rauws took over the central role to calm down the process.

The citizens' assessment regarding the quality of the results and the satisfaction with the process was not noticeably influenced by this "crisis" situation. The voting at the end of the Convention was closed with very affirmative results.

The final statements of the participants regarding the Convention expressed a clear affirmation of Europe and the European identity. A lot of speakers in the Public Plenary emphasized at the end of the First Citizens' Convention, that it was a wonderful experience to discuss "without borderlines" with such ease and find out that the nations share much common ground. This basis was clearly called common European identity.

It is also an advantage, not to believe in stereotypes. Some persons assumed beforehand, that the southern European countries present statements which are strongly related to "conservative" values but these participants showed "liberal" views, less influenced by morals or religion.

4   Content Analysis of the ECD-Website

The internet presentation of the ECD-Project was observed since May 2005. The analysis focused the Website www.meetingmindseurope.org, which provided detailed information on the official launch of the project and on the proceeding to interested visitors. Beside a newsletter (4 postings), the site included the information brochure "Food for thought and debate on Brain Science". This brochure was a central preparation tool for the participants of the Convention and must be seen as one of the stimulating documents, meant to arouse citizens' curiosity and to invite citizens to participate in the project. Another resource of knowledge was the document "Connecting Brains and Society", which was offered in form of a summary, too.

The site also informed about the methodological frame of the ECD-Project, the underlying concept, the general process time line and the envisioned outcome. The results of the First Citizens' Convention can be downloaded, upcoming events are advertised and abridged reports from the meetings at national level were available, too. Downloading files or visiting the html-version was possible to receive the major information.

One document (PowerPoint-Presentation by Mr. Simon Joss) called the essential functions of the website: resource library and interactive communication. The first part of this claim was achieved throughout the timely evolution of the entire ECD-Project. The site met the needs for serving as a resource library for the public for all intents and purposes.

The main site also gives access to the different participating country-sites. Only the English page provides a forum, but actually without contributions by citizens.

Since October 2005 a so called "Web log" on the main website provides a few posted statements by some panellists on their participation in the project. But a real interactive forum was not offered at the main website. The public user were not able to add comments interactively by himself. (cf. figure 1). A recommendation on this is to provide a real place of interaction among the interested public via a web-forum.

In the web log, the participating citizens pointed out to be very pleased with the chosen topic "brain science". Some were even preoccupied with the subject matter and surprised that so many different people can work together so efficiently. One contributor supposed that problems and arguments of various European groups differ significantly, but astonishingly, most of the citizens shared the same fears, expectations and hopes at the First Citizens' Convention. Politically, the ECD-Project was seen as a positive change with a possible impact on the European society. Scientifically, it is regarded as quite amazing, in an overall positive sense, that European citizens want to know more about everything affected to the brain. One citizen mentioned to be uneasy with the fact, that personal opinions were overshadowed by the majority, nevertheless curious on the final results.

Figure 1: Screen shot „Web log"

The "extranet" with accessibility to a limited group of persons, e.g. Facilitators, members of the Steering Committee and evaluators, provided advanced communication tools as fora and a content management system. The content management system (CMS) collected documents related to internal tasks of the ECD-Project. An exchange of views and an access to drafts, activity reports etc. was offered. The "extranet" was divided in sub-sites, called "Partner Consortium Room" (cf. figure 2). This room contains the CMS and a "Facilitators Room". In each case, the rooms were administrated by particular "Room Managers". Users of both sites had the possibility for creating topics, replying on them and posting messages. Yet this possibility existed, nobody participated in these fora. The fora contained only messages by the room manager without any responses or additional comments.

Figure 2: Screen shot of Extranet's "Partner Consortium Room"

The analysis of the website resulted additional findings concerning to the usability of the internet presentation. The loading of the sub-sites took quite long time due to the non-optimisation of pictures. The standard font size was 8 points and therefore not convenient at least to visually handicapped people. One positive aspect was that the pull down menu which regulated the access to the national sites had been improved structurally and also in matters of readability.

4.1   Content Analysis - Summary

The site's function as a resource library is perfectly matched. Only the extranet provided a possibility for discussion on methodological aspects. Nobody perceived the opportunity to participate in the extranets' fora. One negative aspect was, that the possibilities for an interactive discussion for the public users were limited on the main website. The public visitor was not enabled to add comments interactively by himself.

Nearly unexceptional, the comments posted in the web log provided positive assessments. The citizens were very pleased regarding the chosen topic. They appreciated the opportunity for discussing so intensely a scientific topic among laypersons across national boarders. The ECD-Project was regarded as an important step towards participatory governance.

5   General Summary

The task of the first phase of the external evaluation primarily consisted in the preparation of the overall assessment of the ECD-Project. The undertaking focused on the European process level.

This report intended to give assessments concerning the collected data. 14 Interviews with key actors and the observation results of two complete courses of the discussion during the First Citizens' Convention served as a main source of the analysis. Additionally, information was gathered for the initial purpose of a comparison of the ECD-Project with similar initiatives at European level, which were oriented towards participatory technology assessment (PTA) and public deliberation. Another focal point laid on the website of the ECD-Project.

The ECD-Project followed a formal approach of PTA, but the comparison with other initiatives illustrated that this initiative occupied an unique position, because of the following features. The explorative ECD-Design established a relation and interaction between the national and European level throughout the overall process. The project incorporated citizens, Stakeholders, scientists and experts, but, the citizens played the most fundamental role. These participants produced the direct output of the undertaking. Therefore the ECD-Project was not only a possibility to foster (public) participation in technology assessment. It was also an attempt for producing methodological progress.

The central question for the evaluation was, whether the ECD-Project is a successful initiative or not. On the basis of our findings we agreed with the interviewed key actors that the ECD-Project was a successful undertaking.

The process itself was to be seen as an indicator for this major finding but also the outcome of the First Citizens' Convention, which consisted in a broad variety of Themes and questions worked out actively by the citizens. The results of the Convention based upon the mutual intention of the participants like especially some observation details illustrated.

By keeping in mind that one objective of the ECD-Project was to provide methodological progress, the "internal" outcome of the process constituted another remarkable profit. The next steps of the ECD-Project will show, how the experiences which were made especially during the Convention will find their transformation into methods and proceedings.

The perceptions and attitudes of the key actors were strongly related to their sphere of action within the ECD-Project. It was possible to assign the interview partners clearly to three different levels of activity. The Stakeholders were the most divergent group regarding their assessments. The Facilitators were linked to a more operational level and perception of the process. The coordinative professionals belonged to a meso-level with tasks of organising and initiating processes. Each sphere of action was detected being related to special forms of communication, interaction patterns and a special practice, concerning the issues the actors of the field had to manage. The variance of opinions within the Stakeholder group was explained by their different social, ethical and political background. The Stakeholders were the most restrained group regarding the expected (positive) outcome of the ECD-Project. This fact can be explained with the Stakeholders' relative distance towards the direct process.

The other key actors shared a more positive assessment regarding the ECD-Project. One important and process relevant finding was that the basic objectives were transparent to all involved individuals. The main efforts in the future should be orientated on avoiding a development of divergent interpretations of the ECD-Objectives.

The table design as the major concept of the First Citizens' Convention can generally be characterised as a solid, efficient and flexible

technique to organise a discourse-process of this scale. The citizens were enabled to elaborate their statements at the tables deeply. The Plenary constituted the place for further exploration of the outcomes of the tables and for the correction of misunderstandings. The possibility to correct misunderstandings was used by the citizens if they considered an objection as necessary. So it can be assumed, that the results of the Convention reflected the intentions and the opinions of the citizens. The voting result of the citizens in regard to the process and outcome underpinned this assumption. The fact, that the interpretations of the Theme Team and the Main-Facilitators did not always match with the conceptions of the citizens, obviously had no negative impact on the process at all. The positive polling results of the citizens illustrated this.

The problem of translation was not only a result of linguistic interpretation, but also a question of transfer of contextual and cultural semantics as well as corresponding subtleties. A reflection of the structure and the functions of the Theme Team lays in the interest of the methodological progress. A reconsideration is related to the assessment of the importance of the transfer problem.

Another aspect for a methodological reflection was the time problem. Incidents particularly occurred at tables with intensive consecutive language interpretation or in situations, where the discussion became to a slight extend confusing, for example during the "crisis" on Sunday. One of the suggested solutions consisted of the installation of additional time buffers. The problem of time can not be ignored.

Basically, the preparation of the First Citizens' Convention was excellent. The language interpretation and the feedback system, the logistical support and also the multi-media support can be characterised as very efficient and well organised. The Interpreters took over an essential role within the dialog. The intention to spare expenses and efforts by lesser support staff is a methodological issue, which needs to be examined not only because of the direct influences on the process. Different findings lead to the assumption, that the high effort

provided also a symbolical impact on the citizens which fostered their commitment.

Some findings refer to a fundamental problem, which can be illustrated by the difficulties concerning the preparation of the Facilitators. The interviewees criticised the fact, for example, that they had only a short time for preparation and that they were not involved in the beginning. The Facilitators reported that these conditions caused avoidable problems and created a "negative collective awareness" within the group of these key actors. The "angriness" of the Facilitators particularly resulted from their perception that they were not considered and treated as key partners. The Facilitators provided no positive assessment concerning the top down management of the Steering Committee and they reported that they did not have the opportunity to make suggestions as "people in the frontline".

Because these effects were not single findings, they invited to the consideration of the methodological question which modus of management and controlling could avoid such problems in advance and what kind of organisational structures could provide a better communication between the different spheres of action. On the basis of the collected data the suggestion of this report can be labled with "more steering by simultaneously less steering".

"More steering" means that major decisions should be made as early as possible by the persons in charge, in particular if there is to anticipate that time is needed to find an agreement between the different approaches within the Steering Committee. Such a strategy provides the possibility to inform and instruct the partners and to receive feedback. The second aspect is that it should be very well considered to change decisions and instructions, especially during a running process. All persons involved need time and the opportunity to implement sufficiently instructions. All decisions should be made in the knowledge that most of the people involved and also the citizens are not members of the Steering Committee. On the basis of the collected data it can be assumed that for instance a deeper involvement of the

Facilitators into the entire process would have decreased the negative voices significantly.

The term "less steering" requests by the Steering Committee to be more open for suggestions by other key-actors. The attempt to widen the possibilities for methodological suggestions cannot be harmful, especially because of the fact, that the ECD-Project follows an explorative approach. Additionally, the large size of the Steering Committee aggravates fast decision making. This report suggests that situations which require fast and confidential decisions could be managed by a smaller crisis committee. It would be beneficial to involve citizens in this committee. The formal participation of citizens in the Steering Committee would be a symbol and would provide the legitimisation of decisions. Another beneficial effect can be seen in the input from a "practical perspective". Some citizens could be invited at least as commentators. Some authors (Joly/ Assouline 2001) regard the direct control of participants on the production of dialogue as one decisive factor for PTA-approaches.

For methodological progress, it is an important issue to provide a well structured and sufficient documentation of relevant data concerning the project. This is important because the approach of the ECD-Project is an explorative one and there are not much experiences with initiatives of this kind and scale. Many persons involved mentioned that it is not easy to handle the amount of material. It would be easier to manage the internal and external communication, if all documents, especially data files would be labelled by a standard, e.g. date, subject and origin. A good traceability of the process is needed, especially regarding inquiries, that are focused for instance on the ECD-Methodology.

Another issue is more oriented on the aspect of the controlling of the process. Beyond all the results of analysis, it can be reported that there were differences regarding the Facilitators' "quality" (a term used by an interviewee). The "quality" aspect includes abilities and competences but also soft factors. One major finding of the observa-

tions was that the approach of leadership of the Facilitator influenced the discussion process and therefore the results intensely. The Facilitators' quality is related to the question which mental models a Facilitator has on his work and which ways of problem-solving she/he follows. Therefore the qualities of a Facilitator in the Convention must be seen as a function of his perception, thinking, behaviour and above all of his practice.

If supervision is wanted, some of the methodological decisions have to be made. Important questions are, whether the qualities of the Facilitators should be benchmarked or not, what techniques of guidance through the process are useful and which kind of standardisation is reasonable in order to secure comparable results.

The citizens appeared to be well prepared. A lot of key actors appreciated the case study book as a superb tool for preparation. The participants of the First Citizens' Convention were instructed in a meaningful mode regarding their fundamental tasks during the event. This included also cultural orientations as a guideline on how everybody should participate in the discussion.

Because of the high commitment of the citizens, it can be assumed that the participants searched for further information on brain sciences by themselves. The communication of the citizens was not scientific but some table members seemed to be well informed. On the other hand, a few questions, which were needed being answered for an elaborated decision, remained open in some table discussion rounds. The support of experts would have provided a solution for this problem. This finding raises the methodological key question, when experts should be involved in the direct discussion processes. With exception of one single finding, which was mentioned, the collected data suggest no critique towards this aspect at the moment. But, the involvement of experts is still one major methodological question.

As mentioned above, the infrastructural conditions of the First Citizens' Convention, for example the logistical support, the language interpretation and the feedback-system have to be assessed as excellent. It can be assumed that the very high commitment of the citizens was a reaction to these extensive efforts. The participants' enthusiasm can be fostered additionally by the task itself - to hand a civic statement to the European policy- and decision-makers.

The King Baudouin Foundation (KBF) as the initiating and coordinating organisation provided both sources. The KBF can be seen as a very professional, energetic, objective and supportive partner. Beside the entire KBF's staff, which did not shun any effort, Gerrit Rauws took over a central role as major coordinator of the Convention-Process but also during the "crisis" situation on Sunday.

The citizens had the possibility to contribute to the discussion process without any exceptions. The citizens worked towards their tasks in a very practical manner. The event on Friday, some spare time activities and some process-inherent details, for example the mutual support of the citizens in translation and understanding, exerted a positive influence on the development of group thinking and the solidarity within the groups. Some of the citizens contributed very active to the discussion at the tables and influenced the process itself. This behaviour of role taking was socially accepted and has to be seen as a catalyst of the discursive process, which should not be hindered.

Basically there was a good working atmosphere at the tables. The participants usually needed time to come to terms with every new discourse session, no matter whether it was a Plenary or a table round. Therefore each discussion had to be initiated each time. It would have been critical to divide the discussion segments into smaller units. The structuring of the Convention-Process can be assessed as very sufficient and meaningful. The shift between table rounds and Plenary worked well and was also well organized.

To the most interviewed key actors, it remains open what nature and kind of impact the ECD-Process will have on the European society. Not only the results of the ADAPTA report (Joly/ Assouline 2001) suggest that an external impact of a project to the social surrounding normally requires extensive long-term efforts. This is particularly a question of presence within the "normal" media, but also of using the opportunities provided by the "new" media.

The ECD-Project could gain profit from the internet as a modern supportive institution and possibility of discourse. The internet has to be integrated into the methodological considerations and actions. The ordinary process could be escorted by "external" dialogs which could provide comments, additions and additional legitimisation. A variety of dialog-forms, such as newsgroups or for a, fosters the methodological target of exploration.

The First Citizens' Convention in particular helped to make the citizens sensitive – even physically – for the ongoing European process of which they became participants. The task and the process itself were the entry to think in teams across national boarders. This fact and the statements of the citizens in the final Plenary Session can be interpreted as an indication of a common European foundation and communality.

The international cooperation between the participants definitely worked and the citizens thought as Europeans in European dimensions what they appreciated very much.

References

Abelson, Julia / Forest, Pierre-Gerlier / Eyles, John / Smith, Paul / Martin, Elisabeth / Gauvin, François-Pierre (2003): Deliberations about deliberation: Issues in the design and evaluation of public consultation processes. Social Science and Medicine No. 57, pp. 239 – 251

Arnstein, Susan R. (1969): A Ladder of Citizen Participation. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, Vol., 35, No., 4, pp. 216 – 224

Banthien, Henning / Jaspers, Michael / Renner, Andreas (IFOK) (2003): Governance of the European Research Area: The Role of Civil Society. Final Report, download August 2005: http://europe.eu.int/comm/research/science-society/pdf/era-governanceandcivilsociety-programme_en.pdf

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990): The Logic of Practice. Stanford : Stanford University Press

Citizens Participation in Science and Technology (CIPAST) (without year), download November 2005: http://www.wilabonn.de/cipast/cipast.php

Council on Environmental Quality – Executive Office of the President (1997): The National Environmental Policy Act. A Study of Its Effectiveness After Twenty-five Years, download August 2005: http://www.ceq.eh.doe.gov.nepa25fn.pdf

Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC) Sustainable Technologies Programme: Nanotechnology, Risk and Sustainability: Moving

Public   Engagement   Upstream,   download   October   2005:
http://www.sustainabletechnologies.ac.uk/

International Risk Governance Council, IRGC, (without year),
download November 2005: http://www.irgc.org

Joly, Pierre Benoit / Gérald Assouline (2001): ADAPTA PTA PRO-
JECT - Assessing Public Debate and Participation in Technology As-
sessment in Europe. Final Report

Klüver, Lars / Nentwich, Michael / Peissl, Walter / Torgersen, Helge /
Gloede, Fritz / Hennen, Leonhard / Eijndhoven van, Josée / Est van,
Rinie / Joss, Simon / Bellucci, Sergio / Bütschi, Danielle (2000): EU-
ROPTA   Report,   download   August   2005:
http://www.tekno.dk/pdf/projekter/europta_Report.pdf

Meeting of Minds – European Citizens' Deliberation on Brain Science
(without year): About the ECD-Method; download November 2005:
http://www.meetingmindseurope.org/europe_default_site.aspx?ID=3
278&SGREF=3278

Nentwich, Michael (2000): The Role of Participatory Technology As-
sessment in Policy-Making, Contribution to the International Trans-
diciplinarity Conference "Joint Problem-Solving among Science,
Technology and Society", Zürich, 27 February – 1 March 2000

Participatory Approaches in Science and Technology (PATH),
download November 2005: http://www.macaulay.ac.uk/PATHcon-
ference/)

Pimbert, Michael / Wakeford, Tom (2001): Overview - deliberative democracy and citizen empowerment. PLA notes 40, pp.: 23 – 28

Putnam, Robert D. (2000): Bowling alone. The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Touchstone / Simon and Schuster

Renn, Ortwin (2004).: The Challenge of Integrating Deliberation and Expertise: Participation and Discourse in Risk Management. In: Timothey, McDaniels and Mitchel, .J. Small (eds.): Risk Analysis and Society. An Interdisciplinary Characterization of the Field. Cambridge, Mass.: (Cambridge University Press 2004), pp. 289 – 366

Renn, Ortwin / Webler, Thomas / Rakel, Horst / Dienel, Peter / Johnson, Branden, (1993): Public Participation in decision-making: A three step procedure. Policy Sciences, 26, pp.: 189 – 214

Renn, Ortwin / Webler, Thomas / Wiedemann, Peter (eds.), (1995a): Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation. Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse. Technology, Risk, and Society, Vol. 10. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers

Renn, Ortwin / Webler, Thomas / Wiedemann, Peter (1995b): The Pursuit of Fair and Competent Citizen Participation, in: Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation. Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse. Technology, Risk, and Society., vol. 10. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 339 –367

Roberts, Nancy (2004): Public Deliberation in an Age of Direct Citizen Participation. American Review of Public Administration, Vol. 34, No. 4 (December 2004), pp. 315-353

Stern, Paul .C. / Fineberg, Harvey V. (1996):, Understanding Risk: Informing Decisions in a Democratic Society. National Research Council, Committee on Risk Characterization. Washington DC: National Academy Press

Studd, Kate (2002): English Nature Research Reports, Number 474: An introduction to deliberative methods of stakeholder and public participation.

Toogood, Mark. (2000): Techniques for Talking. Participatory techniques for Land Use   Planning. A Review. Report commissioned by the RSPB.

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) (without year): Aarhus Convention (Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental   Matters,   Download   November   2005: http://www.unece.org/env/pp/wgp.htm

Webler, Thomas.,; Kastenholz, Hans,. and Renn, Ortwin. (1995): Public Participation in Impact Assessment: A Social Learning Perspective. Environmental Impact Assessment Review, Vol. 15 (1995), pp. 443 – 463

Appendix

Interview guideline "Main Interviews"

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

Interview guideline "Main Interviews"

This is an interview about your impressions and your judgment about the convention. We would also like to know your opinion on incidents that occurred during the meetings and that you find worth while mentioning to us. It takes approximately 15 to 20 minutes of your time. The interview will facilitate our task to conduct a fair and thorough external evaluation. Feel free to add explanations or comments at the end of the questionnaire if you think it can assist our task of evaluation. All information will be kept confidential.

1. In your view, what are the major objectives of this convention? ➔If several: What do you think is the prime objective?

2. With respect to the objective/s of the convention: Do you think the convention was a success?

3. Are the results of the convention in line with your expectations?

4. How would you evaluate the process of the convention in view of the objectives you had mentioned above: Which elements of the process would you describe as efficient or inefficient in relation to the objectives?
   Efficient   Inefficient

4.1 If not mentioned: What do you think about the table design?

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

5.   How would you describe your own role in reaching the objectives of the convention?

6.   How do you attempt to meet this role (for us: "mediating strategy")?

7.   Do you feel / Did you felt well prepared for your work?

8.   It's a very complex task to get Europeans from 9 countries to 14 tables in order to discuss brain science. Which main problems have you encountered so far? How did you "cope" with these problems?

   Problems   Coping

9.   What kind of problems do you expect in the future?

10.   How do you assess the role of KBF ?

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

11. Regarding to your experiences during the convention: Do you think the ECD process can facilitate and foster European identity among the participants?

12. Can you give an assessment about the commitment of the citizens?

13. What methods do you recommend for incorporating the citizens? What has your personal strategy been to include all participants in your work area?

14. How would you describe the atmosphere at the convention, especially at your table? (-> fairness, ..)

15. How would you assess the preparation of the citizens ? (-> competence to discuss)

16. How do you assess the incorporation of sciences into the ECD-project?

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

17. On average: Do you think the citizens had a fair and equal opportunity to contribute to the discussion and the articulation of the results?

18. Do you think the citizens are content with a) the results and b) the process of the convention?

19. Do you think the coordination-team members are content with a) the results and b) the process of the convention?

20. Do you think the stakeholders are content with the a) results and b) the processes of the convention?

21. What do you think about brain science ? Was the topic well chosen? Is there any relation between this topic and your other activities or your life ?

This is the place to add your own comments and observations that can help us to conduct a fair and thorough evaluation
Thank you for the conversation!

Interview guideline "Initial Interviews"

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

Interview guideline "Initial Interviews"

This is an interview about the major objectives and intentions of ECD. It takes approximately 15 minutes of your time. We have prepared an open questionnaire for the identification and measurement of your initial impressions of the process. This will facilitate our task to conduct a fair and thorough external evaluation. Feel free to add any explanations or comments at the end of the questionnaire if you feel it can assist our task of evaluation. We are not focusing on facts only, but are also interested in your personal impressions and feelings. All information will be kept confidential.

1.   In your view, what are the major objectives or intentions of ECD?

    ➔   What do you think is the prime objective?

    ➔   Do you believe that Europe will benefit from a process such as ECD?

2.   Can you explain us the origins and roots of the project from your point of view? (initiators ➔ persons, organisations vs. visions)

3.   If you had been asked to participate in the ECD process as an ordinary citizen, would you have agreed to become a participant? If so, why?

4.   What would you (personally) like to have accomplished once ECD it is completed?

5.   How far have we progressed in this direction? Is the progress in line with your expectations?

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

6.   It's a very complex task to get Europeans from 9 countries to 14 tables in order to discuss brain science. Which main problems have you encountered so far? How did you cope with these problems?
Problems   Coping

7.   What kind of problems do you expect in the future?

8.   What is your opinion on the selection of the nine countries? Is the number right? Is the selection of countries right?

9.   How do you assess the role of KBF ?

10.   Do you think the ECD process can facilitate and foster European identity among the participants?

11.   What do you think about brain science ? Was the topic well chosen? Is there any relation between this topic and your other activities or your life ?

This is the place to add your own comments and observations that can help us to conduct a fair and thorough evaluation
Thank you for the conversation!.

Main Dimensions of the Observation

Basic data: table nr. ➔ identification, countries, female – male – ratio, estim. age, issue (case, …)

Structures & Logistic

- Facilitator structures the issue? (Main process, discussion)
- Information and transparency to Citizens (mandate, target, action, material)
- Incorporation of Citizens in structural / process-related decisions (how & what type of questions?)

Discussion process

- Structure of argumentation (regarding the process)
    - Development of connected (closed) "argumentation maps"
    - Responsive to each other/to talk at cross-purposes (communication problems)
    - Argumentation consistently developed or does everything remains fragmented?
- Classific. of argumentation: cognitive, evaluative, normative, affective, expressive
- Consensual / dissent situations: when, how? ➔ What encountered so far?
- Communication of agreement/ disapproval in regard to results
- Enquiring

Opinion making

Dealing with consent / dissent by Facilitator	Influence of Citizens➔ Spokesperson
- No. of interventions (interruption of speech, guiding through discussion) - Synopsis - Suggestions of new options, arguments - Converting point of view (in order to achieve a basis for consensus) - Weight of arguments & emphasising - Clarification and summary of point of view - Picking up/ postponing points of discussion	- Strategic approach / Awareness of dominant behaviour, - Legitimisation of authority, per - Expertise - Societal Status - Orientation towards public (moral. argument.) - Appeal for shared values or interests - Other - Alliances of interest, esp.: countries – gender – shared opinion (coalitions) - Fostering European identity?

Atmosphere

- Discussions emotional or objective
- Relaxed – Tensed
- Personal handling (formality, personal response ➔: respect)
- Personal offence (De-Moralisation of others)
- Noise
- Fairness
- Suppression / Support: Facilitator… Citizens

Communication

- Language ➔ Backslide in language of origin (not comprehensible to all)

    Striking feature concerning language (language problems, national differences, gesture)

Dimensions of the Pre-structured Observation-Sheet

Nr.:	Time:		Table-Nr.:	
F.- / M.-Ration:	Estimated Age:		Countries:	
Type:		Issue:		
Interaction	Responsive to each other – vs. monologue Strategically vs. Compromisingly			
Atmosphere	Consensual – Controversial Informal / "Afflicted" Search for synthesis – Drifting apart			
Language	Expert / Technical Colloquial Language problems			
Roles (Citizens)	Experience Knowledge Prestige / Status Role (e.g. „The housewife")			
Content	Cognitive Evaluative Normative Affective Expressive			
Discussion	Interested Engaged Uninterested			
Structures Facilitator (table) Rapporteur, Main Facilitators	Neutral Catalytic Supportive Constructive Synthesising			

Annex B

Meeting of Minds –
European Citizens' Deliberation on
Brain Sciences

Preliminary Report
of the External Evaluation

Stuttgart, May 16, 2006

Contents

1   Observation

1.1   Methods and Proceeding

The design of the Convention includes two basic forms of discussion. Those meetings that were attended by all citizens were called "Plenaries", as it was done during the First Citizen Convention. The complete round of participants was divided into three smaller units for the "Carousel" Sessions. In these smaller rounds, the discussions took place at Monolingual Tables but also at the Central Table. The participants of the Monolingual Tables shared one country of origin or at least one language whereas one citizen of each national table participated as a national representative at the Central Table. The Central Table represented the multilingual respectively the transnational level of the discourse. This general design of the Carousel Sessions was supported by the local placement of tables. The Monolingual Tables surrounded the Central Table. The exchange between the Carousels was provided by the Plenary Sessions but also by two Sessions of the "European Café" on Saturday respectively on Sunday.

The Second Citizens' Convention was attended by two external evaluators and one student assistant, who supported the observation and performed scoring activities. Each observer was responsible for one Carousel. The following descriptions are focused on the events in Carousel 3 to give an impression of a complete process without getting lost in details.

The evaluation team members had to decide whether to focus the observation on a single Monolingual Table or on several various tables during the monolingual discussion sessions. This decision depended on the special circumstances and the local opportunities for surveillance. For Carousel 3 it was feasible to gather information and impressions from the neighboring tables in addition to the discourse

activities at the Carousel Table. The number of observers dedicated to the internal evaluation was high enough to leave the table at times in order to gather data from the other tables. So, the external observer embraced the opportunity to visit the other tables to talk to the other internal observers about their impressions. The observations conducted at Carousel 1 and 2 provided less opportunities to visit neighbouring tables.

The observation was mainly conducted during Friday, Saturday and Sunday, but the team members also attended the events in the EU Parliament on Monday as well as the press briefing at the Hotel Renaissance.

The observers positioned themselves outside of each table to avoid any interference. This distance created no problem during the sessions, which were supplied by translation-headsets. At times the loud background noises made it very difficult to follow the national discussion rounds. A lot of citizens remembered the fact that they were being observed during the First Citizen Convention. Since it was announced that the Second Convention would also be accompanied by systematic observation, the presence of observers was broadly accepted by the participants. Sometimes the participants themselves contacted the observation team for small conversations during the breaks.

The external evaluators used a pre-structured observation tool for the documentation of the process details. Each evaluation sheet covered 15 minutes of observation time. The tool focused on global descriptions and special aspects of the process. The dimension contained several sub-dimensions, which were presented on the observation sheet. The dimensions were as follows:

Atmosphere   included all impressions concerning the general conditions of the discussion and focused "internal" aspects, which were related to the citizens. The dimension explored the mood of the citizens, which was described by means of terms as relaxed / tensed or tired / not tired.

Interaction	characterized the style of communication and interaction of the citizens. The citizens of one table round for example could have been focused on mutual understanding or on strategic reasoning to achieve special targets. The dimension also included aspects of strategic behaviour such as the question of whether actors formed fractions or alliances to achieve their targets. Another important aspect was how the citizens treated each other personally.
Discussion	documented how the citizens participated in the discussion. They could have been following the process intensely or they could have been busy with other activities. Other items related to this dimension were, for example, the relative contribution of each actor to the discussion as well as the resolution of open questions and conflicts.
Roles	was a more bounded dimension and characterized the special functions of individual actors or small groups of actors within the process. The focus was on questions such as who had taken an active role in the discussion and how this had been legitimised and accepted. For instance, if one citizen was taking a facilitation function based on his or her knowledge the observer documented it.
Opinion	was orientated to all content related aspects of the discussion. The main research interest in this category was the classification of types of arguments were being used, whether cognitive, evaluative or normative arguments.
Language	framed questions such as: Did the actors use popular, professional or scientific language or did the citizens' have problems to articulate themselves? If members of an international discussion round had been unable to communicate in the table's dominant language

permanently or during the discussion of specifically complex subjects, it would have been reported.

Structure   was the place for documentation of all "external" influences on the observed process. One major interest here was to capture the effects of the Facilitators on the discussion rounds. Structure also included an assessment of the question of how transparent the process was in the eyes of the citizens and if the participants had gotten the opportunities to take influence on methodological and content-related decisions. Additional aspects were the general support of the tables and the supply with background material: Were the participants satisfied with the quality and quantity of the material they received? Unexpected incidents and major problems were also recorded here.

The measurement with the pre-structured observation sheet was accompanied by several additional instruments. The dimensions of the pre-structured tool were explained in depth by a background information explaining the purpose and the structure of each dimension. Beside the pre-structured tool, the observers took individual notes. This happened especially during process sessions with a lot of activities and incidents. The Carousel Sessions (Carousel 3 completely, Carousel 2 partly) and the Plenary Sessions were recorded on tape or by digital recording.

Several methods of documentation were implemented. First, copies for a simultaneous analysis of the process were produced independently by several researchers. Second, data in form of the files were collected and stored. In the end the quality of data from the filed proved to be of higher consistency than the documentation on tape. Third, the conversations were captured on tape. The recorded files supported the recapitulation of the event after the event. The combination of all three methods provided sufficient material for drawing valid and reliable conclusions.

1.2   Observation - Results

Structure Details of and Special Conditions of the Observation

This section presents the results of the observation during the Second Citizens' Convention for the events of Friday, Saturday and Sunday. The different process segments (Plenary or Carousel Sessions) are marked to give a better overview of every day of the Convention .

The Plenaries took place in a big conference hall and were attended by all citizens and by all external evaluators. The plenary hall also served as the working facility for the meetings of Carousel 3 during the Carousel Sessions. The other two Carousels met in other conference rooms outside of the hall. The membership of each citizen to one Carousel was specified before the Convention and communicated by an view.

Every nation should be present in every Carousel. The membership to the national tables was not only regulated by the nationality of the citizens, but also by their ability to understand the language of the table's members. It was observed, that for instance one citizen from Netherlands attended the table of the participants from UK in Carousel 3. The tables in Carousel 3 differed also with regard to the number of participants.

Each Carousel primarily focused on the development of recommendations regarding two of the six Themes. The Lead-Facilitators of the Carousels were Mark Hongenaert, Natasha Walker and Daniel Stone.

Special permanent conditions of the process in all Carousels were that portable flipcharts were available and that all voting was conducted per hand signal.

1.2.1   Description of the Processes on Friday, January 20

The entire process started with a PLENARY SESSION. Gerrit Rauws welcomed the participants, emphasized the importance of the project Meeting of Minds as well as the general relevance to discuss subjects related to Brain Science. He introduced Jean-Michel Baer, the Director of the Directorate of Science and Society, DG Research, European Commission, who delivered a speech to the citizens.

Gerrit Rauws made some short explanations regarding the proceeding of the Convention and possible problems and constrains, like the pressure of time. He requested the commitment of the citizens and introduced the resource persons, who would especially support the process on Saturday and Sunday. After some short statements of every resource person, Daniel Stone, the Lead-Facilitator of the main process, found some first explanations regarding the overall process and it's objectives. He gave a detailed overview on the proceeding. The Facilitator stressed several times, that the process follows a narrow time frame and explicitly requested the commitment of the citizens. Related to this, the rules of process were presented as well as a central principle of the design: The process will be successful if we find results that are good enough - the outcome does not have necessarily to be perfect. Daniel Stone also mentioned that it would not be possible to explore all Themes completely or to operate with full consensus all the time. The Lead-Facilitator also introduced important persons and their functions within the procedures of the Convention, for instance the members of the Steering Committee and the Producers. Some of the roles were presented as improvements in regard of the irregularities of the First Citizen's Convention. A PowerPoint-Presentation (PPT) supported the introduction.

The citizens listened to the presented issues, but they also had private conversations. Maybe, there was not enough time to discuss private

issues in the short time after arriving of the citizens and the begin of the process.

The CAROUSEL SESSIONS SEGMENT began immediately after the Plenary. The participants went to the locations of their Carousel.

Initial Segment of Carousel 3 Daniel Stone opened the process with detailed explanations of the procedure and the working conditions. The Support-Facilitators, central members of the support team, got the chance to introduce themselves. Other important key-roles and key-players were introduced by Daniel Stone.

The first task of the warm-up exercise was to get to know each other member of the table. The second task was to detect one aspect of the national meeting, that reflected one typical feature of his or her national culture. One citizen of each national table was, to present this aspect to the Carousel after some minutes of conversation. During the Carousel presentations, some differences were reported regarding the way the national meetings were conducted. Some presentations were commented within some table rounds.

At Carousel 2 the atmosphere was relaxed from the very beginning. Although citizens talked at national tables, they didn't seem to want to talk about their impressions of the First Convention, which had been requested as a warm-up by the Facilitator Natasha Walker. Finally one man of the UK-Table told a funny story, what increased the commitment.

Carousel 3: After the warm-up session, Daniel Stone gradually orientated the participants towards the first task of the Carousel. The citizens had to determine the major aspects (Issues) of the first Theme: "Public Information and Communication".

The initial phase of the first discussion block took quite long time because the Lead-Facilitator once again mentioned the 30 second

ground rule. He also explained the change between the Monolingual Tables and the Central Table as well as other aspects of the proceeding. The aims of the next discussion stages were illustrated by defining "Issue" as concept in detail, which includes the description of the selection rules for Issues.

Daniel Stone introduced the first Theme of Carousel 3 in detail. The Synthesis Report was available as copy and the citizens used it as a basic reference for the discussions during the entire Convention. The Lead-Facilitator presented the Issues of the first Theme. After that, the two resource persons offered their point of view to the citizens. The first technical micro problems occurred at this point. Power Point slides supported the presentations during this segment.

The participants were generally highly committed, listened carefully and were focused on the process. But the long instruction time and other session parts set the citizens in an inactive role, the participants took small time outs. Some participants were engaged in quiet conversations while others took to silent activities as drawing or playing with objects on the desk. The citizens showed this two ways of activity also during the presentations of the experts, which generated clear affirmation but also sceptical reactions within the auditory.

Carousel 3: The selection of Issues of the first Theme was discussed at national level before the first trans-national discussion started. The citizens on the Monolingual Tables immediately focused on the task. They were only given a short time. The citizens worked dedicated, cooperative and tried to find a consensus as fast as possible, even with different opinion existing. One man of the British table was very active and led the conversation to a slight extent, which supported an open discussion. He was chosen as the first representative for the discussion on the Central Table.

Some members of the German table didn't understand the proceeding. Despite the fact that the information was given by the Facilitator, the citizens didn't quiet realize, what to do in the Central Table dis-

cussion and that only two Issues of the Theme were supposed to have been selected. One member of the Steering Committee supported the German table and explained the discussion proceeding again. But, it can be assumed that certain aspects of the proceeding were not clear to other citizens either.

The citizens of Carousel 2 also discussed the most important aspects of the chosen Theme on Monolingual Tables.

After a short introduction by the Main Facilitator Natasha Walker, the Issue "Regulation and Control" was discussed by the citizens in the national groups on base to the synthesis report. The discussions were stagnant at the beginning. The commitment of the citizens was low. The Support Facilitator encouraged the German table, but most citizens from all nations stayed inactively.

The resource persons explained their point of view after the discussion at the Monolingual Tables. The citizens were listening attentively during this time and asked the experts questions, which were answered in a very personal and constructive way.

Carousel 3: Daniel Stone instructed the citizens shortly about the proceeding on the Central Table. Another important rule was that the members of the Central Tables should present their individual point of view.

The participants of the Central Table presented their statements in serial order supported by their notes that they had taken during the monolingual discussion. The speakers made focused and short contributions. Although they tried to hold eye contact, a significant discussion did not take place. Daniel Stone led the conversation and summarized the most important aspects.

The citizens at the Monolingual Tables listened carefully and wrote down some notes individually. Some participants took small time outs. Obviously, the citizens had some problems to follow and remember all the results, respectively all of the discussion details of the Central Table. This problem increased in the next sessions and the

notes, taken by a Support-Facilitator on a flipchart, didn't seem to be the optimal way to solve this problem.

The citizens of the Monolingual Tables shortly discussed the contributions of their returning representatives after the closure of the discussion at the Central Table. This was observed at the German table but this activity appeared in the other table rounds, too. One important Issue of this smaller national conversation was how the speaker's contributions in the central round represented important results of his or her table.

After the discussion on the Central Table, the Carousel went into an open dialog of all participants. The citizens used this possibility to add and comment some aspects and they corrected Daniels Stones interpretations, if they felt improvement as necessary. The contributions were presented in a cooperative and constructive manner. The participants were highly committed and contributed a lot of aspects. They offered deviant perspectives with respect to the other Carousel members and argued orientated towards the task and the contents. The atmosphere can basically be characterized as open, communicational and productive. The discussion round quickly found a consensus concerning the most important Issues and correspondingly a clear voting result. But the discourse process was generally influenced by framing conditions such as the narrow time frame.

One important finding in relation to the selection phase of the Issues was that the citizens raised questions concerning the methods and the design of the process. The proceeding was not completely clear to everybody. One statement of the citizens focused on the problem of selecting only 2 Issues of the Theme. Daniel Stone again emphasised that there was not enough time to face more key aspects. There was no further big discussion in the Carousel, but a lot of citizens were not satisfied with these methodical actualities. The process didn't run optimal.

Additionally, more open forms of diversion were observed during this phase of the process. Some participants, for example one woman at the Italian table, made lavish drawings also the number of draw-

ings per drawer increased. But these observation details can not be interpreted as a complete retirement from the process because they appeared as short timeouts respectively as an action besides listening.

Carousel 2: The representatives on Central Table discussed interactively, tried to understand each other and were very open-minded. The opinions were communicated in a committed way concerning the content which finally led to a very constructive discussion. The Main Facilitator summarised all arguments without textual influence and assured the correct understanding by inquiries. The citizens were asked for new arguments but instructed to be focused only on the most important points. The Main Facilitator played a central role for motivating and focussing the citizens.

The representatives at the Central Table had the possibility to discuss with the resource persons and ask the experts questions, before the conversation was opened to all citizens. The interaction between citizens and experts was very constructive. Most of the citizens on the Central Table stayed highly committed and interested. Some citizens on the national tables, which could not participate on the discussion, seemed to be tired and they yawned. The following selection of the two Issues was led by the Main Facilitator and proceeded smoothly.

Carousel 3: After a break, the elaboration of the recommendations regarding the first Issue of the first Theme began. The initial block was much shorter than in the time segment before. Daniel Stone explained the stages of this session. The first task was to clarify the first Issue in a short discussion at the Monolingual Tables. The citizens got special prepared sheets to take notes if necessary. But the National Synthesis Report conduced the process as focal tool.

Every citizen participated lively in the discussion. No solid leadership roles were observable. The member of the Steering Committee again gave advice to the German table. It was louder than in the discussion before, so it became difficult to understand the conversation and the argumentation line on a special table. On the German table

the representative was instructed by the members of her table to emphasise special aspects of the Issue in the discussion at the Central Table. It can generally be assumed, that the behaviour of the representatives was to some extent a reaction on the advices of the national table.

The citizens of the Carousel 2 discussed focused at Monolingual Tables. Some citizens had problems identifying the most important arguments. The Facilitator had to intervene the discussion on the German table to give the instruction, that citizens were only to focus on the most important aspects of the Theme.

Carousel 3: Daniel Stone opened the discussion of the Central Table. The citizens presented their contributions one after another. They were focused on their task, argued orientated towards the content and tried holding eye contact. Overall, the citizens came to better terms with the discussion.

Daniel Stone summarized the most important aspects and one Support-Facilitator noted them down on a flip chart. As mentioned above, this form of presentation to the Carousel was not optimal because the place for notes was limited, not everybody had a good view on the flipchart and it was not easy to make corrections and additions, etc..

Again, some technical problems occurred (feedback-noises of the micro). Most citizens at the Monolingual Tables followed the discussions of the representatives intensely, but the diversion activities increased. Some participants drew or made some drawing games.

One special deflection of the process occurred. A citizen remarked that there was a problem concerning the translation. Some terms of the translation would not match with the original content, which also was one of the problems of the Synthesis Report. During the next sessions the problems in relation with the translation occurred several times and was mentioned by several persons.

Overall, the citizens were not satisfied with the process. This effect was strengthened by smaller incidents, which additionally disturbed

the process, for example, the loud feedback-noises of the micros and small irregularities in the proceeding.

Carousel 2: Each of the representatives of the Central Table discussion gave a summary of the arguments mentioned on their national tables. There was no discussion and no interaction between them. The Main Facilitator sometimes had to intervene the process to secure, that all aspects were noted. She also encouraged the citizens to participate in the discussion, but instructed that contributions should have a clear reference to brain science.

The experts made comments on the mentioned Issues after the discussion at the Central Table. They also reminded that it is necessary to focus on the relevant aspects of Brain Sciences.

Carousel 3: Daniel Stone gave instructions regarding the next steps of the proceeding before the first elaboration of recommendations started. The interactions on the Monolingual Tables began immediately. The citizens were highly committed, cooperative and the atmosphere seemed to be more relaxed than before. One reason for this fact was probably the more spacious time budget. It seemed that discussions about the methodical actualities and the proceeding took place on some tables.

At the focal tables of this round the citizens were orientated towards the task. The Synthesis Report was used as a reference of work. The citizens found new aspects and wrote them down. There was a larger variance of opinions then in the session before, but the participants acted constructive and communicative when somebody expressed a dissenting perspective.

The support team had a short meeting during the monolingual discussion. One of the most important improvements was that the statements as well as the additions and corrections of the citizens were written down "online" on a PPT-Slide, that was projected to the Carousel. Therefore, the produced content was visible and available for all citizens.

Carousel 3: The discussion on the Central Table got a more convenient time frame than before. The representatives offered concentrated their ideas but tried to refer to other contributions, that a dialog was constituted. The process came into run. Daniel Stone acclaimed that after the discussion. He led the round and pushed the process forward, but requested explanations if statements were not clear. The Lead-Facilitator summarized the contributions of the citizens and secured the right understanding. His leadership became more interactive in this phase. Two argumentation lines were detected: freedom of information vs. quality of information. Related to that discussion of contents the citizens criticized that there is too much material to handle in the project as well as in the Convention.

Although the citizens at the Monolingual Tables listened concentrated there were diversion activities observable. These forms of behaviour were also found during the resource persons' comments. Obviously the people got more and more tired from this point of time. The Input of the resource persons was not applauded heartily.

Carousel 2: The participants of the discussion at the Central Table were engaged and tried to present clear contributions. The discussion took place in a relaxed manner and citizens discussed the recommendations focussing on the facts. Thus, the dialog remained fair and respectful, even when different positions were presented. Later on, a discussion emerged between citizens and experts. The Main Facilitator didn't interfere, but summarized the most important arguments afterwards. The Main Facilitator led the process, requested reformulations, summarised the Issues and connected statements of the experts with the questions of the citizens, so the interaction between Main Facilitator and citizens was very constructive and the statements of citizens were discussed in detail.

Carousel 3, Carousel Plenary: Daniel Stone introduced the round and presented the recommendations. He led the conversation and the discussion began immediately. Comments, additions and corrections were offered all of the time. One citizen tried to create consensus by

combining the two argumentation lines, which were developed in the phase before and which had become an important aspect of the discussion. Another citizen often contributed to the Carousel Plenary round, while also having busy discussion activity at his national table. Other citizens also had smaller discussions alongside the participation in the main round. The comments were collected and projected.

Before the voting process began, Daniel Stone explained the proceeding and especially the voting rules. He also illustrated the aim to prepare a common draft recommendation agenda for the European Café on Saturday. The Lead-Facilitator read all recommendations. Some of the texts were very long. Sometimes the translation was not finished as he wanted to proceed with the next entry. After the critique of some citizens, Daniel Stone presented the statements slower. Such events like the critique interrupted and disturbed the entire process on a surface level. The process didn't run smoothly.

Small incidents and irregularities during the voting effected a trembling of the process in a deeper level – a few citizens inquired the content and the source of recommendations in a more insistent and aggressive form. The comment of one writer of the support team was that there were problems entering all of the recommendations into the file. The inquiring of the citizens generally had several reasons. First, one text was ambiguous. Second, it was unclear, what was the basic thought of one recommendation. Third, the citizens were not able to identify the origin of one text, respectively they didn't recognize their statements. There was a problem of visibility of the produced content.

At this point of documentation is important to emphasize that the task of writing down the statements of the citizens was very difficult, because of the complexity and the details of the contributions as well as because of the framing conditions such as interfering sounds, unclear pronunciation, etc..

The form of the citizens critique as the incident itself can be interpreted as another indication of the general displeasure of the citizens,

which was obviously associated with some direct objections of the citizens concerning the proceeding. On the other hand some citizens didn't care about the process Issues. They were more worried about their spare time and wanted to finish the round and the working day.

Some participants didn't expect another Carousel session after this process step. This finding is based especially on comments and conversations at a few tables and was related to the impression, that the commitment of the citizens decreased. This can be seen as an additional retardant factor of the process.

The situation was cleared and the process continued with the improvement of recommendations respectively with the voting. As a result, this short storming-phase was important because it constituted the process practically. The entire discourse process needed time getting stated. 4 recommendations for the European Café were selected, what was a very solid result.

Carousel 2, Carousel Plenary: During the ongoing discussion between citizens, national differences emerged gradually, and some citizens tended to be dissatisfied with the process. In one case, there was no agreement regarding the formulation of a recommendation and the Carousel had to vote. The process of formulating the recommendation also remained vague after the voting and the situation escalated. The Main Facilitator decided to make a small break.

The citizens were more concentrated after the break. The participants tended to understand each others position during the following discussion, but they didn't find an agreement on the formulation of one certain recommendation. The Main Facilitator asked the citizens how to continue and the participants decided to start the voting of the recommendations, but to review them in the European Cafe.

One reason for this general situation was that the voting process was not clear. This caused an escalation. The different perspectives regarding the content were a peripheral problem. The support team and the Facilitator had no solution how to cope with the problem.

Carousel 3: After the break, the working phase began with a short instruction. The final objective of this process segment was to find recommendations regarding the second Issue of the first Theme. Daniel Stone apologized for the irregularities of the last session.

The discussion process began with the clarification of the Issue at the Monolingual Tables. The discussions started immediately, but it was noticeable that the citizens were tired and they mentioned being hungry. Some diversion activities took place again, but the drawing etc. didn't stop the participation in the table discussions completely.

The citizens of Carousel 2 were not focused on the national discussions at the Monolingual Tables any more. The Main Facilitator had to motivate the citizens. In addition, he instructed them to continue with the discussion focused on the European perspective.

Carousel 3: The citizens of the Central Table contributed to the discussion focused on the facts, but there were also existed a few moments, where no one had comments. The representatives held eye contact and discussed interactively. One citizen, who was generally very committed, contributed lively, but did not take a leading influence on the discussion because of the structuring of the process.

Daniel Stone led the round and summarized the statements, which resulted in an agreement. The participants around the Central Table were mostly attentive, but sometimes they were set in a passive role. Some members of the national tables dedicated themselves to diversion activities.

Carousel 2: The discussion on the Central Table proceeded slowly and in the same way as the discussion at the national tables before. The participants discussed their different perspectives and some national differences were observable, but the citizens tried to argue constructively. The following discussion at the national tables was more concentrated and focused, but the citizens seemed to be tired.

Carousel 3: The next task was to sketch the recommendations in a Monolingual Table Discussion. Daniel Stone summarized all aspects, that had been collected during the discussion round before. But then

another irregularity during the instruction disturbed the proceeding. The discussion at the Monolingual Tables was abetted by the spacious time frame and the entire process ran better. One reason for people becoming increasingly tired, can be seen in the stuffy air of the conference hall. The loudness during the discussions was more of a problem for the observation than for the citizens. Due to the discussion tables being small, it was possible to move closer together whenever necessary.

Daniel Stone led the following discussion round at the Central Table and gave short instructions regarding the target of this process step. The citizens were strongly oriented to the Lead-Facilitator and the interactions were structured to a high extent by the process order and especially by the serial processing style of contributions. Still, the participants tried to hold eye contact and gradually developed a real exchange of arguments in form of an intense and efficient conversation. The participants were very focused, made very elaborated and short statements. They presented their arguments to one another with respect. The representatives were basically highly committed, but there were also a few moments in which no one contributed anything.

Daniel Stone secured himself to understand the citizens correctly, sometimes the citizens made additions or explanations to his interpretations. The members of the Monolingual Tables were mostly focused on the discussion at the Central Table, but some diversion activities were observed.

After the discussion at the Central Table the resource persons had the opportunity to comment the recommendations and to present their perspective to the citizens. Some technical problems occurred (microfeedback-noise) and the citizens seemed to be more and more tired. One participant wrote a text message, others drew.

Carousel 2: Some of the citizens on the Central Table discussed actively, while the other participants seemed to be interested, but not motivated to discuss any more. Most of the citizens at national tables tried to stay focused, but some were nearly asleep.

Carousel 3, Carousal Plenary: Daniel Stone presented all recommendations supported by the PPT-projection. The produced content was visible for the citizens. This process feature was clearly improved in comparison to the Carousel sessions before. The citizens made additions to the agenda of recommendations and corrected some phrases during the entire Carousal Plenary.

Regarding the aspect of visibility, one problem was that not all citizens were able to read English. So, sometimes the interpreters sometimes had to translate a recommendation again. Daniel Stone instructed the citizens to make only additions that would produce new and relevant content. He was a bit stressed as some citizens kept their eyes on "evergreen" details. In this phase a new diversion activity was observed beside the usual ones. A bigger number of citizens left the Carousel for a short time, one woman from Italy deserted it completely. This affected the conditions of the following voting of recommendations.

Daniel Stone read every recommendation before the votes of the citizens was counted. A number of citizens didn't follow the process completely, but participated in the voting. People were very weary and became more and more impatient. The absence of citizens constituted another problem.

An Interpreter came to Daniel Stone during the voting procedure and demanded that the Lead Facilitator should read slower for the translation to be done in time. Four recommendations passed the voting. Daniel Stone thanked all participants, who applauded, and gave the prospects for the proceeding on Saturday. Some participants didn't understand the instructions and explanations. The steering committee member supported "his" table.

Carousel 2 Carousal Plenary: The commitment of the citizens decreased in the following plenary discussion and the voting of recommendations was not satisfactory for them. Only a few citizens participated in the discussion – the most of them took it for boring. A problem of the voting process was the rule of two-third majority. The

rules of the voting process were not transparent enough to the citizens and also to the persons in charge.

1.2.2   Description of the Processes on Saturday, January 21

The process on Saturday began with a PLENARY-SESSION. Daniel Stone gave a prospect for the working day and introduced Reinhard Kuchenmüller, the Graphic-Facilitator, who presented his impressions of the Friday process. The projection show of the drawings was appreciated and heartily applauded by the participants.

Daniel Stone informed the participants about the proceeding, especially about the European Café. He gave an impression of the objectives of this working step and instructed the citizens how to conduct them. The European Café secured an exchange of minds between the different Carousels to collect as many aspects as possible in an explicitly free dialog atmosphere. Every Carousel had the chance to get an impression of the discussion in the other rounds. The intro was supported by a Power Point Presentation and the citizens got a handout of the locations of the Cafes during the different discussion segments. Music was played before the first session began

During one European Café Session the members of one Carousel visited another Carousel in its field of operation. One participant per nation stayed at the Monolingual Table in his or her "Home"-Carousel and welcomed the members of its national panel from the other Carousel. A discussion between citizens over the "boarders of the tables" did not occur in Carousel 3.

Carousel 3: Two Support-Facilitators, Marta Csabai and Luc Dewulf, opened the FIRST EUROPEAN CAFÉ SESSION and gave a short overview on the Themes and Issues which had been elaborated.

They introduced the two citizens, who presented the recommendations and results of the sessions on Friday. The presentations of the citizens were excellent, but a few technical problems, for instance concerning the slide projection, occurred at the start-up time. The entire process was interrupted and irritated by these problems to some extent. Although, the citizens at the Monolingual Tables listened concentrated and took notes. They were irritated by the irregularities. After short instructions, an open European Café dialog began at the tables, but seldom between tables.

The citizens basically worked intensely and very focused. The "resource citizens" of Carousel 3 explained the Issues and recommendations in detail. They had a high proportion of speech, but they received and noted the comments of the visitors. The discussed contents touched a lot of citizens emotionally. Differences between cultures and national practices regarding the style of the discussion were observable. Some tables rounds proceeded loud and lively, other rounds were more reserved. The Support Facilitators went around and tried to help when needed. The objectives of this Session were projected and gave an orientation to the citizens. Sometimes the conversations continued after the "stop" command of the Support-Facilitator.

The experts and theoretically the visitors formed another discussion round located at an extra table apart the main activity. The support team conducted a short meeting to discuss improvements of the process. A few support team members seemed to be stressed.

The first European Cafe in Carousel 2 did not start optimal. For the citizens the following process was not clear, which caused some confusion. The slides of the draft recommendation were handed out as copies, but a considerable number of citizens could not read and understand the English texts. After explanations and translations by the Support Facilitators to clarify the content, a controversial discussion between all citizens on the German table started. The "resource-citizen", who presented the results of the Friday sessions, had to defend the produced recommendations against the visitors, who were

angry regarding the formulation of some texts. The core argument was that too much content was lost. The discussion was shortly influenced by the Facilitator, who reminded the citizens to stay focused to the content of the Issues.

The Citizens of all tables discussed engaged and emotional, but were orientated to the content and tried to find a consensus communicatively. The proceeding of the European Café was not introduced in all important details. So the participants didn't know exactly what they had to do. This applied equally for the Facilitators.

Carousel 3: THE SECOND EUROPEAN CAFE SESSION started and continued in a comparable way to the foregoing session, but ran much smoother. Only a few small problems with one projection occurred. The improvements of the last short meeting of the support team were conducted and the process was abetted by the experience of all persons involved. Some discussion groups at the Monolingual Tables were smaller than others. The citizens maintained intense conversations, in which the "resource citizens" played a central role. A lot of participants wrote down notes. The citizens as well as the support team were more relaxed.

The atmosphere during the second round of the European Café of Carousel 2 was more relaxed than in the round before. The citizens worked in a very constructive and communicative way. The German citizens of the second round discussed in a more friendly way. A few disappointments regarding lost arguments were expressed on other Monolingual Tables, but in general the visitors accepted the results.

Carousel 3: The target of the following Carousel Session was the REVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS of the first Theme, Issue 1. The "resource citizens", who stayed behind in Carousel 3, reported the most important results of the discussions during the first European Cafe Session. The member of the Steering Committee, who led

the round of visitors and experts, also participated as a member in this Central Table group.

Daniel Stone led through the conversation at the Central Table after a short introduction and instruction. Basically, there was a good, productive and task-oriented working atmosphere. The commitment of the citizens was high and they presented their Issues very focused, held eye contact, paid attention to the other contributors and treated one another friendly, sometimes with joking. One participant tried to speak in English, but then failed. Daniel Stone encouraged her to speak her mother tongue.

The process ran smoothly, although some small technical problems occurred. Daniel Stone had to instruct the participants that the contributions should be as short as possible without repeating statements, due to the limited time for this step of process. The citizens presented the results of their cafe discussions and made general or concrete additions to the recommendations. Some contributions were complete proposals. This phase effected an enrichment of content. Focal start issues were that the draft recommendations were not detailed enough and to simple as well as that some draft recommendations were very difficult to implement. The citizens payed attention not only to complete arguments or statements, but also to concrete concepts and terms.

The citizens found a number of improvements, which were collected and projected by the support team. Daniel Stone summarized the statements and tried to relate them with the concrete draft recommendations. He instructed the support team to find solutions for an adequate projection of the changes.

The discussion steered towards agreement, but was shortly disturbed by a citizen at one Monolingual Table, who wanted to support one statement. The citizens around the Central Table generally listened concentrated; some activities of diversion were observable. The work of the resource citizens was appreciated by Daniel Stone as well as by the audience that applauded.

The atmosphere on the Central Table in Carousel 2 was a little bit depressed. Although the citizens discussed, the commitment was low. They seemed to be disillusioned and they were dissatisfied about the cancellation of one Issue and regarding other amendments made by the visitor-citizens. The Main-Facilitator had to motivate them and she asked for suggestions.

Carousel 3: The discussion continued in a mixture of the Carousel Plenary and voting process. The Lead-Facilitator announced that the time had elapsed. He suggested to project the draft recommendations one after another and to conduct a voting about, whether changes should be implemented or not. Daniel Stone gave instructions, informed about the voting rules and asked the participants for confirmation, which was given.

Daniel Stone read the recommendations. The changes were visualized in the projection. If one change had an obvious a majority, the explicit counting of votes was skipped. The time pressure increasingly impacted the process and caused negative effects.

The process in general and the interactions were very complex at this point of time, because everybody had to reflect the extensive amount of notes, the content that's stood behind the draft recommendations and the changes, the presentation of Daniel Stone as well as the current process features like the voting proceeding. Additionally, the interpreters played an important role, because they transmitted the information between the Lead-Facilitator and the audience.

The process began to tremble when the citizens inquired the meaning of one recommendation after the voting. One practical reason for that could be that the translation had not been finished. A few recommendations were obviously not projected correctly and some aspects seemed to be absent.

The source for a complete irritation of the process was that one recommendation was not formulated clearly and structured enough. One French citizen criticized that explicitly and demanded to produce a clear and precise base of statements for the voting. Daniel

Stone agreed, and suggested to design a sufficient proceeding together with the participants, but he also referred to the time pressure. He argued that later steps of the process should lay more focus on the correct terminology. The citizens did not seem to be satisfied with this.

One resource person suggested not voting for a single recommendation, which was applauded by some citizens. The citizens insisted that the meaning of the recommendation should be clear.

Daniel Stone referred to the time pressure and suggested to read the recommendation again for the voting to produce the outcome of the session. This was accepted and the voting then proceeded in a fast way by the solid sequence: reading of the recommendation and – if necessary – interpretation by the Lead-Facilitator and voting.

The interpretation of the Lead-Facilitator can be interpreted as the common understanding of one recommendation if the citizens accepted this interpretation. One clear impression was that the citizens were not satisfied. Some conversations caused laud background noises alongside the voting process, but still, the citizens gave their comments and additions regarding the recommendations actively.

After smaller irritations, like the non-understanding of one recommendation, the session found its end. A citizen mentioned that it being very difficult to follow the process without an overview in form of a handout sheet. The other Carousels had worked with such an overview. The Lead-Facilitator apologized for that and promised improvement.

The support team now had to discuss the procedure, because the task finishing the entire first Theme had not been completed. The decision was to close the Carousel Session for the lunch break. The process was completed after the break.

Carousel 2: Most of the citizens didn't participate actively in the Plenary discussion. Different opinions were presented and the Main Facilitator had to structure the contributions and motivate the citizens. She summarised the statements and explained the voting proc-

ess and the rules as well as the importance of this process step in detail. Everyone had the choice between four options. The voting process was not transparent to the participants but they recognised, that it was necessary to vote to keep the process running and to gain some result.

Carousel 3: After the break the Carousel 3 started with the review of the recommendations of the first Theme, Issue 2. There were some differences in proceeding to the first review session.

The suggestions for changes were presented by the "resource citizens" at the Central Table. Daniel Stone led the conversation and accepted only contributions on the focal Issue, which were suggestions for changes of the recommendations. A Support-Facilitator reported it being difficult to place additions such as comments in the notes. After the collection of the suggestions for changes, the Carousel voted instantly, about implementing them or not. The concrete style of the recommendations was not the matter in this session. So, one recommendation after another was elaborated.

Daniel Stone cared for the progress of the process, but the citizens always had the chance of making suggestions. The discussion proceeded in a clear and transparent order. The content related interaction and communication between Daniel Stone and the support team, especially with the Support-Facilitator, who took the notes, was closer and more efficient than in the session before. Small methodological adjustments were implemented easily and the content was carefully recorded and presented in a more transparent way than before. The correction of recommendations was organized more efficient and constructive. In sum, there were clear methodological improvements by Daniel Stone and the support team. The process ran better and was more transparent for the citizens, who worked quite concentrated and very committed.

The outcome additionally supported the proceeding. The citizens applauded as Daniel Stone closed the round for a short break. Daniel

Stone and the support team did very good in using the incidents to recognize crucial points of interaction and communication. This was helpful in making fast improvements and constituted a lot of important experiences. The efficient and communicative discussion phase indicated that it is possible to create results in a fast and interactive way. But this needs experienced professional staff.

Carousel 2 started with the discussion at the Central Table after a short break. The atmosphere was relaxed but the participants were not motivated. Some problems regarding the meaning of translation occurred at Monolingual Tables, but were solved very fast.

Again, national differences emerged during the process. The citizens from UK emphasised, that there was no need for a legislative regulation at European level. Still, an agreement was found regarding the different perspectives and also concerning the concrete formulation of the Issues. The participants referred one to another and it was easy for the Main Facilitator to summarize the arguments.

Only a few citizens participated actively in the discussion, increasingly more of them were tired and not motivated. Other citizens, at the British and the German table, slept. Some didn't even listen to the translation. The Main-Facilitator had to instruct them to participate in the process.

During the break, the external evaluators talked to citizens as well as with persons in charge. These persons emphasized, generally detecting a clear common European sense in the Convention. The citizens were dissatisfied about the complexity of the process and mentioned, that the process progressed too slow and was focused to many on details. The lack of transparency during the entire process dissatisfied all people. Neither for the citizens nor for all Facilitators, was the proceeding transparent in all aspects.

Carousel 3: The selection of Issues of THE SECOND THEME "Normalcy vs. Diversity" started with a longer introduction by Daniel Stone, who gave an overview about the process as well as

instructions for the next work-items. He remarked, the ECD-Project being also a learning process and the importance of staying focused on the main concepts and contents, as opposed to concrete terms. This was not appreciated by the participants.

The Lead-Facilitator reminded the citizens of the selection criteria for an Issue and the definition of an Issue. Smaller problems occurred during this initial segment, for instance regarding the projection of the Theme's Issues. Daniel Stone instructed to use the National Synthesis Report as reference, but he recognized that the order of Issues was not the same in the different national versions. So, he read all Issues.

The resource persons were introduced. They presented their comments to the audience which applauded considerably. One expert lauded the contributions of the citizens explicitly. This initial segment had a clear proceeding and ran well. The atmosphere became more relaxed. Some citizens laughed.

Carousel 2 started with a Plenary discussion after the lunch. The resource persons explained their point of view concerning the Theme " Equal Access to Treatment". The atmosphere was relaxed, but the citizens listened focused to the presentations of the experts, who contributed their arguments in a colloquial language. The citizens understand them well. The Main-Facilitator instructed to refer on the synthesis report in the following discussion at the Monolingual Tables. The participants were focused and committed.

Carousel 3: The citizens got their first active role in the first discussion at the Monolingual Tables. The task was to explore the Theme and to identify and collect the most important Issues and aspects for the following "central discussion". The conversations were conducted lively.

The discussion at the Central Table was replaced by another form of discussion, presumably to regain the lost time. The representatives still stayed at their national tables. Each table had the possibility of suggesting one new important aspect to the Carousel Plenary. The

citizens contributed very focused. The commitment and the coopera-
tion of the citizens was generally very high in Carousel 3. The citizens
basically supported the process as highly stress-resistant co-workers,
despite of the fact that they also expressed critique. Some citizens can
be characterized as "partners" because of their outstanding engage-
ment.

Some national tables found an agreement regarding the importance
of one Issue and the Plenary round quickly gained an agenda of im-
portant aspects, which were projected. The Carousel tried to find and
to combine the common Issues after that. The projected Draft-Issues
were improved permanently. One woman demanded the translation
of the Issues, because they were projected in English. So, Daniel Stone
read all texts and a discussion began regarding the content of one
Issue. Finally, 5 Issues were produced.

Daniel Stone interacted closely with the citizens. He called them by
their first name, thus the relation became more familiar. This sup-
ported the interaction. But he had also to instruct the citizens to stay
focused in the discussion and not to talk about private things.

This way of discussion was very efficient. Despite the question,
whether it saved time or not, the conversation gained and improved a
clear outcome by a high interactive process, which was transparent
by content, method and proceeding and in which the citizens partici-
pated actively.

The participants had the opportunity of voting for a maximum of two
Issues. Daniel Stone instructed them shortly and made sure that the
citizens accepted the conditions and read each Issue before the Vot-
ing started. The audience listened carefully. The voting behaviour
was obviously related to the membership to the national tables. Of-
ten, the whole table voted for one Issue or against it.

The critique on the final result arose about one selected Issue being
too broadly based. Another suggestion was to combine one selected
Issue with another one. Daniel Stone commented to accept a re-
voting and the suggestions were discussed. A citizen argued that the

combination made no sense. The experts were also asked regarding this problem. They answered that no direct relation existed and the lively discussion continued. Finally, the Carousel voted for the combination of the two Issues.

Carousel 2: The citizens of the Central Table were relaxed and tried to find an European consensus communicatively. Each citizen presented the results of his or her national table. The interaction between citizens from different nations turned into a real European discussion and differences were dismantled in an constructive way. The Main Facilitator summarised all arguments and requested new suggestions. The citizens on the national tables were tired, but focused on the discussion at the Central Table.

The representatives from the Central Table had the possibility to request comments by the resource persons. The interaction between the citizens and the experts was very constructive and trustful. The participants and the resource persons were interested in understanding the arguments that were presented and reflected about them. The Main Facilitator didn't influence this process.

In the following Plenary, the participants requested further explanations of aspects from the experts. The contributions of the experts were important to enrich the knowledge of the citizens. The participants were focused, wrote down some notes and suggested amendments. The Main Facilitator structured and summarized the contributions. It was important that Natasha Walker used the language of the citizens as well as the way of how they formulated the sentences. The following voting proceeded without any problems.

Carousel 3: The elaboration of the draft recommendations of Theme 2, Issue 1 began after a break. Daniel Stone gave an overview about the session and explained small changes in comparison with the sessions on Friday. Small problems concerning the formatting of the slides retarded the process. The Lead-Facilitator demanded a reformat for a better readability and then presented the Issue. The citizens

were to conduct a Monolingual Table discussion to clarify the Issue and to expose, why the Issue is important for the citizens. A focused but also relaxed working began. Maybe the generous time frame facilitated this atmosphere. The participants took notes and had an intense dialog all of the time.

The central discussion started with the collection of one suggestion per table. Daniel Stone ensured that all comments were taken into the slide-presentation. When necessary, he stopped the contributions so that the support team had the chance to complete the texts. The participants were focused and committed, but nevertheless activity of diversion was observed. Daniel Stone summarized the statements into core aspects and instructed the citizens to detect the first draft recommendations in a discussion at the Monolingual Tables. The conversation began gradually. The citizens took notes and worked focused. The Synthesis Report was used as reference.

Carousel 2: The next step was to substantiate the Issue for formulating the recommendation. The discussion started at the Monolingual Tables. The atmosphere was relaxed and the citizens discussed focused, interested, committed and referred to one another.

Carousel 3: The representatives met at the Central Table for the design of the draft recommendations. The citizens presented their contributions in serial order, related to Daniel Stone as leader of the conversation, but held eye contact to one another. Some citizens at the Monolingual Tables, painted or were busy with other activities of diversion. The Support-Facilitator signalled to stop the discussions for completion of the notes, what indicates the closer involvement of the support team in the process and the increased importance of the notes. The discussion continued, but the Lead-Facilitator now cared more for the progress of the discussion.

In this situation, a more difficult discussion began, caused by different perspectives on one aspect of content, maybe also strengthened by particularities of the translation and / or by the perception of the citizens. The following text summarizes the most important observations, but also tries to reproduce the content, because this discussion

had a noticeably influence on the process and on all of the persons which had participated.

The French representative talked frankly about being shocked by one statement regarding the (prenatal) diagnosis of abnormalities or diseases and she characterized the Hungarian statement as intolerant. The association with aspects such as euthanasia was made, because the Hungarian statement (as it was translated) contained the aspect that the diagnoses should also focus on dangerous diseases for the society, which should be eliminated in the view of the Hungarian table member. Another citizen supported the French critique. The Hungarian representative emphasized that the statement was focused on diagnosis of diseases, which are critical. But she also explained again that diseases can be a burden or a danger for the society. Scientists had the position to give a diagnosis. The Hungarian statement also connected brain diseases with the genetic features.

Daniel Stone wanted to give the word to other representatives, but the French participant demanded, that the Lead-Facilitator should wait until the translation had finished and she also demanded not to ignore the important statement. She wanted to clarify the problem completely, but all citizens accepted Daniel Stones suggestion to hear statements of other citizens, which were offered.

Daniel closed this discussion round and summarized that this was a discussion of diversity. He instructed the citizens to follow the process, because at the tables some smaller discussions started. The resource persons got the opportunity to comment the draft-recommendations.

The first contribution was especially focused on the discussion between the Hungarian and the French representative. The expert answered, that it is not the job of scientists to decide, what is normal or abnormal. He also argued against a too short relation between genetic characteristics and behaviour and suggested to build an interdisciplinary ethical committee for decisions of normalcy and diversity. The other resource person agreed with this contribution and also pronounced against a selection by means of a physical fact.

Carousel 2: The following discussion on the Central Table proceeded constructively. The Citizens on the Monolingual Tables listened very interested. The citizens contributed actively. This took much time. Each representative had the opportunity to present his or her own point of view. But the contributions were more orientated to the Main Facilitator then to the other table members, that in sum, a real discussion on European level didn't develop.

Another fact is also remarkable. The participation on the Central Table was organized by the citizens in different ways. There was no structural rule, that regulated the order of participation in the discussion at the Central Table. Some citizens participated twice, others citizens were never representatives of their national table.

Carousel 3: Daniel Stone summarized the comments of the experts and gave the instructions for the following Carousel Plenary discussion, which was a possibility for the citizens to review the agenda and to make additions.

The Main Facilitator presented and read the produced draft recommendations. Sometimes he requested an explanation by the citizen, who suggested a recommendation. The process did not run smoothly but was interactive and focused on the improvement of the content. The projection was the central tool in this phase. After Daniel Stones invitation, the citizens suggested some additions and made comments. A citizen, who was a representative at the Central Table, didn't find her statements in the notes.

The ongoing discussion was focused on the term normalcy and on other concepts which were used in the agenda, but Daniel Stone suggested looking for new contents not only for terms and gave additional minutes to collect all ideas. Most participants followed the process attentively, but some citizens left the Carousel for a short time. The people seemed to be tired and Daniel Stone requested the attention of all citizens when smaller discussions at the national tables began.

Daniel Stone introduced the Voting with instructions and explanations of the proceeding. At times, he had to read very long recommendation texts, before the voting started. The Lead-Facilitator finally closed the Session for a short break.

Carousel 2: The representatives shortly returned to their Monolingual Tables and evaluated the last arguments of the discussion at the Central Table. The most aspects were clear. Only smaller conversations were conducted.

The citizens at the Central Table started to formulate the recommendations and inquired comments of the experts. Additionally, the citizens had to find an agreement regarding the differences concerning the formulation. The citizens tried to develop a common European result in a factual discussion.

The Main Facilitator collected the recommendations, which were then projected. It was necessary and productive to use the flexible way of presentation because the formulation of the recommendations was changed several times before the voting started.

The Main Facilitator collected and summarized the recommendations and checked the wording. Some single questions were discussed in the Plenary. The Main Facilitator tried to structure the discussion but without interference of the content.

The problem of finding the right wording for a recommendation was solved by a short voting organized by the Main Facilitator. This strategy worked well and the result was accepted by the citizens. One reason for the commitment of the citizens can be seen in the fact, that the voting process and its meaning was transparent. Furthermore, this can be interpreted as an indication of a high democratic awareness of the European citizens.

The "normal" voting process revealed some national differences concerning single recommendations. The decision of the citizens in the voting of some Issues was linked to their nationalities. Some problems occurred in the voting process. The rules of the voting process

seemed to be arbitrary and not transparent. For the citizens it was not clear, why they had to vote ten times instead of two times on Friday.

Carousel 3: The next segment focused on the design of the draft recommendations of Theme 2, Issue 2 for the European Cafe on Sunday. In the first step, the citizens at the Monolingual Tables discussed the question, why the Issue was of such importance. The participants worked focused, but were relaxed. Some laughed. But the citizens became increasingly tired. The table members took notes and used the National Synthesis Report.

Carousel 2: The discussion of the first Issue started on the Monolingual Tables. The atmosphere differed from table to table. For example, the citizens on the German table seemed to be relaxed. The participants at the Hungarian table discussed very lively and members of the Italian table were not motivated to dispute, so one of the Facilitators encouraged them.

Carousel 3: Daniel Stone called up one citizen of each table to present the most important aspects of the table conversation in the "central discussion". One group assessed the Issue generally as important, but had no further comment to it. Another table round didn't find additions to the National Synthesis Report. Daniel Stone instructed some citizens to submit their notes slower, so that the interpreters had the possibility of getting the translation done in time. He also summarized long statements of citizens and the most important aspects of the entire discussion. This additionally supported the understanding. A new observation finding was, that one of the "partner-citizens", who were usually very high committed, was busy with drawing during this phase. This can be interpreted as an indication that the activity of diversion was a timeout, but no general turn away from the discussion of content. The participants became increasingly tired.

 The following discussion at the Central Table was led by Daniel Stone, who instructed the representatives to speak slowly, so the support team had the opportunity to write all aspects in the notes.

The citizens made their contributions one after another and worked focused on the task. One citizen took the Synthesis Report as a direct source for her contribution. A lot of recommendations were suggested. Daniel Stone inquired special aspects or the citizens had to repeat their statements for the support team, which wrote down the notes carefully. The interaction between all actors worked well.

The entire process profited from the clear order of proceeding, the transparency of method and content and this productive interaction of all persons involved. 14 recommendations were collected and the resource persons got the chance to comment the outcome after the discussion at the Central Table. The citizens seemed to be very tired during that phase of inactivity and they had problems staying focused in the other phases.

All citizens got the opportunity to improve the draft recommendations during the following Carousel Plenary Session. The projection of the draft recommendations was the central tool of this time segment. Some microphone problems disturbed the process as Daniel Stone explained the proceeding and as he wanted to read the first recommendation, which was very long. One statement after another was read and improved, one was consensually divided into parts. The participants suggested an improvement in a more insistent form. The announcement of improvements was at times not easy, because the recommendations in the slides were not structured well and not numbered in correct order.

Daniel Stone had to instruct the citizens several times not to conduct private discussions. The attention of the citizens decreased. Some people left the Carousel for a short time. The Lead-Facilitators commented that the citizens looked very tired.

Carousel 2: The atmosphere on the Central Table was relaxed and the citizens stayed focused on the relevant aspects. A real interaction between the representatives of the national tables didn't constitute. The Main Facilitator summarised the statements.

Some of the citizens discussed during following discussion in Plenary very actively, others lost their attention. After the Plenary, the Citizens worked at the Central Table on the formulation of the recommendations. A controversial discussion arose and national differences emerged again. British and German citizens argued about strengthening the control of the public-health-system regarding the medication of chronic patients at national level. The Main Facilitator structured the discussion and motivated citizens to participate in the discussion.

The plenary got the opportunity to make some amendments or suggestions regarding the recommendations before the voting started. The most of the citizens were not motivated any more, so the final stage was dominated by the influence of some single citizens. The resource persons commented some aspects and discussed them with the citizens communicatively and with respect. The Main Facilitator checked the wording of the recommendations and read them. She also asked for additional comments or amendments. New wordings were suggested by the citizens.

Carousel 3: Daniel Stone introduced the Voting with a few short instructions. He read every recommendation before the citizens had to raise their arms for their agreement. A problem occurred regarding the formulation of two recommendations. The citizens were not able to locate their suggestions in the slides respectively the content of a certain recommendation was not clear. Daniel Stone asked the participant, who suggested the recommendation, for an improvement or an interpretation. Finally, the statement was deleted because nobody was interested in. The other recommendation was quoted from the Synthesis Report and was explained by the citizen, who suggested it. Again, Daniel Stone read the recommendation. A participant, who suggested another recommendation, which was rejected, said that his table didn't vote for the recommendation because the content of this statement was not recognized or clear. The editors of the notes didn't capture the meaning of that suggestion. Daniel Stone explains that the source of this problem lies in the fact that the objective of the pro-

ceeding is to document the core meanings. He requested the commitment of the citizens to vote for these core meanings not for special formulations and terms. The Lead-Facilitator offered two possibilities, first to stop the proceeding and look for improvements or continue with the process. The process pursued with an improvement of the second recommendation, but some citizens were presumably not satisfied with the methodical actualities.

The tiredness of the citizens caused several effects on the process. On the one hand, the tired citizens were more insistent and less relaxed or patient, what happened concerning some reviews of recommendations. On the other hand, the behaviour of the participants became more passive, the commitment decreased and it appeared that they wanted to finish the session as fast as possible. These different types of behaviour and attitudes interacted with a lot of factors, like the question, whether the citizens had an active or passive role within the process or whether they were interested in a recommendation or not.

Basically, the citizens were very tired, so they didn't pay much attention to the running process. They became active, if an important recommendation was in the focus of the discussion. The citizens reviewed the recommendations together with the other table members that every time some participants answered if Daniel Stone asked, how to solve problems concerning the content. Sometimes problematic statements were deleted, but the impression was that they were deleted because of their content. The citizens always had the opportunity to stop the deletion. Unclear recommendations were explained and re-voted. But at least one citizen left the Carousel before the Session was closed.

The conditions of work were not optimal, the process didn't run well either. In sum, the pressure of time and the tiredness influenced the process negatively. A lot of recommendations were not completely clear to the participants or the citizens didn't recognize their statement within the text.

Daniel Stone closed the voting and it was difficult to keep the citizens staying in the Carousel for some moments to clarify who want to stay

behind in the next European Café on Sunday. Some volunteers for the presentations of the recommendations were found, too. The dinner was served in the Museum of Modern Arts.

Carousel 2: The Voting continued without any problems regarding the proceeding, but some citizens demonstrated their tiredness and also their discontentedness and didn't participate in the voting process. For instance, most of the British citizens were out of the voting process, some of them slept. The other citizens also seemed to be very tired and were not motivated to vote. The last voting process ended at eight o'clock pm after a working day that started nearly 12 hours before.

1.2.3   Description of the Processes on Sunday, January 22

A Plenary-Session initiated the Sunday event. Daniel Stone introduced the Graphic-Facilitator Reinhardt Kuchenmüller, who presented a slide-show of the drawings, that he created on Saturday. The citizens applauded him heartily. Daniel Stone gave an overview on the agenda of the next process steps and explained the most important details. Soon the citizens were dismissed for the first round of the European Cafe. Again, they got a copy with the information, which Cafe they had to attend.

Carousel 3: The two Support-Facilitators, Marta Csabai and Luc Dewulf, welcomed the citizens to the first European Café Session and explained and commented the proceeding as well as on the two Issues, that were chosen. Two citizens presented the recommendations of the Carousel. The arrangement of the initial phase was successful.

The citizens worked concentrated, took notes and used the prepared sheets as well as the Synthesis Report during the discussion of the

Cafe. The people seemed to be tired during the start phase. Beside the main rounds of citizens a group of experts also discussed, but a lot of the table members were members of the Steering Committee. The Café was supplied by refreshments at the end of this phase.

Carousel 2: The atmosphere of the first European Cafe started re-laxed. The Support-Facilitator justified, why the numbers of Issues had to be reduced in the sessions. She used a flip-chart when she painted an iceberg to show that the task of the session is to identify the most important Issues - the top of the mountain. Additionally, the rule was established that the resource-citizens only had to inform the visitors about all recommendations of the Carousel, but they did not have to defend the results. Another Facilitator presented the outcome of the previous day in detail.

The citizens discussed actively and focused on the task. Later on, the discussion seemed to be more aggressive at some tables. Some visitors of the Carousel were not satisfied with the results and the wording of the recommendations.

Carousel 3: The two Support-Facilitators opened the second European Café Session and shortly explained details. They instructed the Carousel and introduced the two citizens, who presented the recommendations.

An energetic discussion was developed by the participants. But there were some differences between the tables regarding the way how the discussion was conducted. The activity at a few tables was very high, other tables were strong orientated towards the written content at the beginning so a conversation gradually began. Another impression was that the size of the tables influenced the discussion. Smaller rounds discussed quieter than bigger ones. The resource persons at the experts table were as relaxed as the citizens. Sometimes they laughed. The experts' round sat longer than the citizens.

Carousel 2: The Facilitators instructed the participants in the initial phase of the second round of the European Café. The features of the

discussion were equal to the round before. The atmosphere on the German table was friendlier than in the first round and citizens tried to come to a European perspective.

Carousel 3: The review of the draft recommendations of Theme 2, Issue 1 started with a short introduction by Daniel Stone. He instructed to keep all contributions brief, especially the suggestions for changes of recommendations. This directives set better conditions of work for the support team, which wrote the amendments onto the presentation slides. The Lead-Facilitator also ordered copies of the draft recommendations for every national table to increase the visibility of contents.

The "resource citizens", who stayed behind in Carousel 3, were invited to the Central Table to present the outcome of the discussions during the Cafes. One resource person joined the round as a representative of the expert's table. The citizens presented their contributions one after another. They were primary orientated to the Lead-Facilitator, but held eye contact with the other members of the Central Table. The notes of the citizens were a very important resource of the conversation. The interaction was orientated on connectivity and general understanding, The wording of recommendations was discussed. Daniel Stone pushed the process forward and instructed to give only concrete changes as one representative criticised a recommendation in a too general way. He also declined the suggestion of this citizen to formulate a more specific amendment in the table round. Daniel Stone justified his decision by the elapsing time. A lot of suggestions were collected and documented into the notes during this phase.

Carousel 2: The citizens interactively discussed the final wording for the recommendations on the Central Table and tried to find an agreement regarding the sometimes controversial opinions. The Main Facilitator played a central role in the discussion. The completion of the recommendations by the development of amendments proceeded well and in a transparent way.

Carousel 3: The discussion was opened to the Plenary and the citizens came to the vote concerning the incorporation of amendments into the recommendations. The Amendments were highlighted in the projection until they were accepted or deleted. Entry after entry was elaborated by the Carousel. The citizens found additions to the changes, also after Daniel Stone instructed to bring in only "important" contributions. He closed the discussion for the voting of the changes, which was not easy to conduct, because some amendments were focused on the same aspect of one recommendation. But the round solved the problem in consensus by the leadership of the Facilitator. The process finished nearly in time and the Carousel applauded. Daniel Stone gave time for additions. A new recommendation was produced and passed the voting.

The process was done by very concentrated cooperation of all persons involved. The discussions proceeded well and led to a consensual outcome. The improvements regarding the visibility and the solid and transparent order of the procedure supported the process to a high extent.

Carousel 2: In Plenary, the citizens conducted a difficult discussion. Most citizens tried to suggest formulations that found the acceptance of all participants. But, some citizens were very relaxed and tended to sleep. The support by the Main Facilitator was important in this situation. She tried to integrate the different perspectives, which was not easy. The following voting proceeded well, except the fact that some trouble arose regarding the lack of transparency of the voting process. Most of the citizens could not understand the rules of the voting process. It was not transparent, why and when which kind of rules counted. Especially the French citizens criticised the rules. The question of the acceptance of one new amendment, which would mean a change in the planned process, was decided by using a two-third majority. The French citizens criticised that in that case, that makes no sense, and it would be better to vote yes or no. This led to chaos and the Main Facilitator lost the control over the process, and broke up the discussion with reference to the writing group, who

should take notes of all arguments. Also, the Greek citizens were angry about the voting process and demonstrated no understanding. Citizens asked why a two-third majority is meaningful concerning a voting about the process. They argued that it would make sense only in contextual questions.

Another problem was the language. The synthesis report as basic information was available only in English. So some citizens had no basic information to refer to. Another problem was that the shown wording of the recommendations was in English. For some citizens it was not easy to follow the fast formulation of the recommendations, because of translation problems which also included problems in interpreting the meaning of single words. So the possibilities to participate in formulating the recommendations were not equal for all citizens.

Carousel 3: The review of the draft recommendations of Theme 2, Issue 2 began immediately after the first review session. The members of the Central Table suggested amendments again. The suggestions of the resource person were also documented. The inclusion of resource persons and their amendments generally seemed to be accepted by the citizens.

The Process ran more experienced. Daniel Stone assumed that one amendment of a citizen was written down in one of the sessions on Saturday. So, he rejected the inclusion of one suggestion into the notes, but wanted to clarify that point with the leader of the writing group. Additional suggestions were collected, before the voting started. The improvements were made in a common consent and in strong cooperation of all persons involved. The interaction of Daniel Stone and the whole Carousel was very close. The round worked on complex Issues, but the proceeding had a clear order and was transparent, like the session before. At the end of the phase, Daniel Stone thanked the resource-citizens, the support team and the interpreters for their support.

Carousel 2: The atmosphere at the Central Table was relaxed and the citizens participated interested in the discussion. They tried to find an agreement of arguments. The Main Facilitator picked up the new amendments, but explained that it was not necessary to formulate the sentences in a perfect stile. The statements were written down and projected by using the beamer. The Main Facilitator asked whether all citizens of the Central Table agreed with the formulation. One person requested to take-up an Issue that was lost yesterday, what was accepted by the Main Facilitator. This decision caused new confusion, because other participants didn't agree with this procedure and the Main Facilitator opened a new round for all citizens to make new recommendations. The final voting proceeded well, but citizens seemed to be a bit confused.

Plenary: The Drawing Exercise was led by Reinhard Kuchenmüller. The Graphic-Facilitator instructed the citizens after a short introduction and gave them the task to draw a scene, how Europe will look like with the new results of brain research. The citizens had the choice to paint with participants of their own panel or together with other persons. The finished paintings were exhibited with drawings of the Graphic-Facilitator. A few citizens didn't appreciate this session, but a lot of participants enjoyed the exercise as a pleasant change and applauded Reinhard Kuchenmüller.

Daniel Stone took the leading role as the drawing exercise was finished. He summarized the results, which were developed in the last sessions and introduced the participants in the final steps of process. The Lead-Facilitator explained especially the following National Meetings of the panels. One representative of every Carousel had to present the recommendations of the Themes 1, 2 and 3 to the Plenary before Daniel led over into the National Meetings.

The National Panel Meeting was the last possibility for the citizens to review the recommendations and to suggest one last "most impor-

tant" amendment. This amendment had to pass the vote of the national panel with 2/3 majority. In the Plenary before , the citizens were instructed by Daniel Stone to decide from a European – international perspective. The Lead Facilitator mentioned also that it wasn't possible to conduct this discussion in form of an international session, because of the limitations of translation.

The German Table Facilitator, Antje Grobe, repeated the central rules of the meeting and gave some detailed instructions. The task for the citizens was to read a prepared sheet with the translated recommendations, but the text had not been translated completely. Some persons involved supported the process by translating the rest of the work-sheet while the national discussion proceeded. The Italian group, which was located in the same room, discussed actively and very loud, what disturbed the entire process to a big extent. The text was very long and the citizens had the impression that passages were different to the text that had been produced in the elaboration sessions. Some citizens, who suggested a recommendation, didn't recognize their contribution in the slides. The time elapsed while possible amendments were collected on the flipchart. A lot of comments were given regarding the wording and it's understanding. Some amendments were formulated as advice to the writing group not as a suggestion to the Plenary.

The interaction was close, some citizens had bigger proportions of speech than others. The discussion of aspects did not always finish in consensus and often had to be pushed by the Table-Facilitator to a vote. Antje Grobe was open for comments and proceeded slower if the citizens demanded this. The process started gradually, the people worked very focused, but were not relaxed at all. Another Facilitator, who assisted and the National Coordinator translating the text, entered the round and supported the process. But the working conditions were not optimal.

One text was very long and was not in the correct order so that one Facilitator had to explain the structure, what took a lot of time. The citizens galloped through the text and agreed whole pages of recom-

mendations because of the elapsing time. The intention of the citizens to finalize the review process maybe was caused by a practical orientation of efficiency. But there was also the impression that the citizens surrendered by the amount of material. The group from Italy finished much earlier than the Germans. The most participants agreed with the core-meaning of the text and the process finished in time, but some citizens didn't appreciate the whole process and/or the outcome.

The first round of the Plenary was introduced by Daniel Stone, who informed about the proceedings of this phase. Six panels suggested proposals for amendments and the Lead-Facilitator gave the instruction that one citizen of every panel, which made the amendment, had to explain the intention of the modification. After that, the Plenary had the possibility to comment the amendment before the voting started. Every citizen got one green card to signal his or her agreement with the implementation of the amendment.

The improvement phase of the recommendations started after the instructions of the Lead-Facilitator. The number of people was counted before the voting. Not all citizens participated in this important session. Smaller conversations of the citizens at the tables caused a high background noise, which increased during the voting. Daniel Stone was very focused on the process, but made some jokes.

One suggestion contained a change of a word, but Daniel Stone rejected that. He said that "wordsmithing" is not possible in the Plenary because that would be to complex in consideration of the time pressure. But he affirmed that the advice would be transmitted to the writing group. But one participant defended the change. Daniel Stone ensured that the intent of the statement is clear and initiated the voting after nobody wanted to give further comments. The process continued. The French amendments didn't pass.

One reaction toward an amendment was, that the suggestion was only focused on a tiny detail. This statement attracted attention espe-

cially through the aggressive way it was presented. But the amendment passed what was applauded heartily. The process continued with very high voting results for the changes. A small break was put in.

Daniel Stone initiated the second round of the Plenary, in which citizens of the Carousels presented the recommendations of Theme 4, 5 and 6. Two recommendations were presented additionally.

The process began to topple with the critical statement of one member of the French panel, who was in the writer group. He said that at least one recommendation was presented in completely different ways by the writers than it was formulated by the citizens. Daniel Stone immediately requested the projection (via PPT) of the recommendation. The original recommendation was read and the discussion of the problem went on until Rinie van East contributed. He explained that only the core of the recommendation was presented without the argumentation, the report would be more extensive. He conceded that it could be possible that mistakes like skipping words etc. were made. A lot of citizens wanted to respond on this comment. The participants criticized that content is missing or they didn't recognize their statements respectively the source of the texts was not clear. The form of the participant's critique was focused on the content and stayed objectively but the process stopped and the citizens were worried and angry.

The process stopped totally for the clarification of the problem. Daniel Stone collected comments which were presented in a constructive way. The process got another quality as one French citizen made fundamental critical remarks on the proceeding. He argued that presenting incomplete recommendations on the slides was not fair. The speaker characterized this fact as unjust and questioned the validity of the results of the first round. This statement was strong applauded. Daniel Stone stopped the process for a short break.

The Lead-Facilitator explained the proceeding as the discussion continued. He argued that the citizens actually got a handout of the original recommendations during the National Meeting. The pro-

jected slides would represent the core of the recommendations, but maybe sometimes the slides didn't match with the real recommendations. Additionally, he gave the instruction to the participants to transmit all corrections and essential problems of meaning to the support team.

But that was only the first step of gradually calming down of the process, because one following inquiry of the citizens was related to the documentation of results in the report. Daniel answered, that not all information would be available on Monday in form of the report, this would be too much material to prepare. He stressed that the final report would include all results like minority comments and all documentation material.

The citizens were not satisfied. It was a clear impression that the participants were worried about the quality of the outcome and they wanted to secure the quality. Another comment, which demanded that the voting only continues on base of the complete recommendation text, got applause. Daniel Stone replied that he is looking for an acceptable solution. He called to participant's mind that the time is very limited and so it would not be possible to conduct an additional round for a review or voting of the recommendations. The situation aggravated.

The Lead-Facilitator referred to the objective of the process to produce a result, which is "good enough" and inquired, what should be done to solve the "dilemma of time" and to finish with an outcome. Daniel Stone slowly and respectful explained the problems and was open for the comments for the citizens, what was the basis for a constructive discussion about the further proceeding. But the storming phase was still not over.

One participant summarized, that all the citizens had invested a lot of time and commitment to work out the results. She explicitly expressed her impression that the quality of the results gradually impaired in the last days and demanded a proceeding of elaborated work or to stop the process with an option to continue later.

The discussion became constructive with the contribution of Rinie van East, who suggested to project the original text of the recommendations for a direct improvement. This was applauded. Another statement considered the problems of the proceeding, but effected a further reconciliation of the process because the speaker argued generally for a constructive restart of the process. The audience applauded heartily. A lot of comments were made. The discussion gradually built a new base for the resumption of the process. Another writer commented that he checked all texts and all were ok. He appealed in vivid words to pursue the process. Another speaker agreed.

The discussion between Daniel Stone and the Plenary went into an interactive and close dialog to find the most accepted option of proceeding. Nevertheless, the citizens had a lot of smaller conversations so that the Facilitator had to instruct them to focus on the Plenary discussion.

The Lead-Facilitator synthesized the statements of the participants to 3 choices. First – to stop the process, which was obviously declined by the participants; Second – to review the entire recommendations, which would produce a big time problem; Third – to proceed as scheduled, despite of all irritating aspects. Daniel Stone asked the audience for other options of proceeding and some citizens gave their comments while the complete text of the recommendations was distributed to the Plenary as copy.

As one reply on a comment, the Lead-Facilitator apologized for the in-transparency of the proceeding. This was an important symbolical action, that additionally supported the interaction between the audience and Daniel Stone, who personified the whole project team in this discussion.

A voting regarding the acceptance of the third option had the result that 85 citizens wanted to proceed as scheduled. The citizens went to the locations of their National Meeting.

Germany: The citizens had intense discussions about the Plenary session as they walked to the National Panel Meeting. The National Coordinator explained the reasons that only the core meaning of the recommendations was presented in the slides. The slides were projected as a summary of the final recommendations, which were prepared by the Writing Group. The Coordinator also mentioned that some citizens participated in the Writing Group and he assured that nothing, that was produced in the different working sessions, was really deleted. The complete recommendations would be presented in the final report. Another source of the problem was that the recommendations had to be translated.

A few citizens were excited because of the toppling of process. They said that they don't understand why other citizens insisted. Some panel members requested again, whether the original recommendations, which were produced during the discussion sessions, are placed in the final report or not. The process began after this short meta-discussion.

The participants read the texts, after the Table-Facilitator insistently instructed the citizens – several times – to be focused on the notes. The citizens then worked focused and a discussion established quickly on a "relevant" Issue. An improvement of one term was discussed. The suggestions were written on the flip chart by a Facilitator.

Most citizens worked very task-orientated and committed to finalize the phase successfully. One citizen refused to participate in the discussion at the beginning because his impression was, the conversation aimed at irrelevant details too much. Sometimes the citizens didn't understand the text completely or phrases were not formulated clearly. These texts were reported to the Writing Group.

The table members worked intensely but the time elapsed. Although interactions became frantic, the round produced results every time. The citizens decided to only read the highlighted statements, because it was too much material to handle to finish in time if all texts were to be reviewed in all the details. This situation obviously increased the concentration of the citizens. The conversation at the Italian table was

very loud, which complicated the German discussion. The citizens reviewed all statements.

Italy: Most of the Italian citizens were angry and disappointed about the process in general. They discussed actively in a controversial, but consensus-orientated way and they tried to produce an output. Some citizens no longer participated. The Facilitator motivated the citizens and instructed them to stay focused on the main problems and to calm themselves down.

In the final PLENARY, the results of the National Meetings were presented and the citizens had to vote for or against the implementation of amendments. Daniel Stone led the discussion and offered the first amendment, which was explained by one member of the Greek panel. After some inquiries of Daniel Stone regarding the meaning of the Greek amendment, the participants used the possibility for their comments, but the Lead-Facilitator tried to limit the contributions with the instruction that only very important statements should be submitted to the Plenary discussion because of the elapsing time. Alternatives to the first amendment were collected. For instance, the Germans made a suggestion and got the chance to clarify their statement. The members of the Plenary had the chance for a contradiction after that. Two versions for a modification of the recommendation were presented by the panels of Belgium and Hungary. Both suggestions were explained by one citizen of each panel and were discussed in the Plenary. The process stoped for a moment because the amendment of the Hungarians was not available on the projection screen.

As all amendments were available and highlighted in the projection, Daniel Stone thanked for the short comments and introduced the voting with instructions regarding the rules. The situation was complex because of the number of amendments respectively the amount of texts. Finally, the amendment which affected only small changes passed the voting. One citizen tried to save "his" suggestion by initiating a revote or a combination with another suggestion, but Daniel

Stone referred to the clear and transparent rules of voting and continued with the next amendment.

The Plenary dealt with 4 amendments regarding other recommendations. The proceeding had the following order in the whole time segment – presentation of the suggestion by Daniel Stone, explanation by one citizens of the panel, what proposed the change – collection of comments respectively of 1 contradiction – voting.

It can be documented that there was obviously a clear correlation between voting behaviour and nationality. Often complete tables voted for or against one amendment. The proportion of acceptance was high at the end of the phase and every clear outcome of the voting was celebrated. Daniel Stone interacted very close with the citizens. He had to lead the discussion and pushed the process forward, but tried to conduct that in arrangement with the Plenary. The clear rules and the transparency regarding the proceeding supported the process.

Some national tables suggested more than one amendment and the organizers did not recognize this immediately. Another problem existed regarding the language. The amendments were written down in English and some citizens were not able to understand English or they were not content with the translation. The citizens got the impression that content and topics had gotten lost.

The citizens had small table conversations at which there was always considerable background noise. Daniel Stone often instructed them to stay focused on the Plenary process, but the citizens didn't fulfil this directive completely.

Finally the process was closed by Daniel Stone nearly in time and the citizens applauded very heartily. The Lead-Facilitator introduced Gerrit Rauws, who first informed the people about the proceeding regarding the event in the European Parliament. He apologized for the problems and the irritations, which was applauded by the citizens. After that he closed the Convention and thanked all the people involved and especially the citizens with a small souvenir.

1.3   Summary and Conclusions of the Observation

Looking at the observation data and the processing of the discussion material, one can conclude that the major objective of the Second Convention has been accomplished. The participants successfully produced what was envisioned in the project: They developed a common statement of European citizens concerning the subject of brain science.

The National Synthesis Report represents a second important outcome, that was accomplished under hard work and major efforts by the citizens. The participants used the National Synthesis Report intensely as a source of reference during the Second Convention. This can be interpreted as an indicator for the strong social acceptance of this document and the strong link that the participants forged between the two reports.

The preparation of the citizens was excellent. This applies to their accumulated knowledge in regard to the subject of brain science, their competence to deal with this subject in the dialog as well as their general communicative performance during these meetings. Despite the fact that some citizens left the Convention, the participants can basically be characterised as reliable and stress-resistant during the entire process, which turned out to be a major factor for success. The citizens were, however, less prepared to follow the procedures and had difficulties in understanding the working conditions of the Convention.

The design of the Convention and especially the Carousel Method in general worked well. Each Carousel was focused on the elaboration of 2 Themes and 2 Issues per Theme. This design enabled them to work out recommendations on a broad variety of topics with reference to the National Synthesis Report and the national discussions. The European Café as well as the national meetings at the end of the

Convention assured an intensive exchange between the Carousels, whereby for instance the national meeting of the German panel took place under great time pressure, that the results of the dialog in the Carousel's were fast inspected by the citizens.

The interactions between the Monolingual Tables and the Central Table in the Carousel functioned successfully and were efficient. The monolingual discussion prepared the exchange between nations, languages and cultural particularities at the Central Table. But, the structuring of the tables indicates one major feature of the process conditions. The methodological design was basically orientated on "technical efficiency". This basic orientation of the process on the progress was sometimes gained at the expense of the quality of the discourse and was related with a strong structuring of all procedures.

One major aspect of the given structure referred to the elaborated system of rules and definitions which formed the whole process. The citizens and also the other persons involved were faced with a lot of detailed information which caused a high "cognition load". The complexity of the rules, procedures and detailed definitions affected irritations and uncertainties, led to irregularities in the process design and made it necessary to provide additional explanation and legitimisation of the rules and the procedures.

One adequate illustration for this finding are the voting rules. The methodological decision was to regulate the voting processes by different rules depending on the conditions of the situation and the target or importance of the voting. Recommendations required, for example, a two-third majority, other decisions required a simple majority. Such a diverse voting scheme can only support the process if the decision making process is a result of clear transparent procedures. This transparency was often not given and the participants were confused.

The two-third rule was meant to assure that a vast majority of the citizens would support the recommendations. The "filtering" of recommendations is acceptable but comes with a price. It favours broad communalities and common denominators rather than providing

explicit and pointed recommendations. Given that one objective of the entire process is to explore the diverse perspectives of the citizens and to establish a further discussion in society, such a streamlining process needs to be interpreted with caution. The elaboration of the (national) content could have been "spicier" if the process would have tolerated more diversity in thinking and the explanations. The legitimacy of the final result would not be decreased by allowing for more diversity and the discourse process would not be inefficient or overly complicated if more variation in opinion had been produced.

Another special feature of the two-third voting rule was that sometimes no recommendation passed the voting. This "recommendation killing" was legitimised by the rules but did not produce the desired results and decreased the motivation of the citizens.

With respect to the voting behaviour, the observation team detected a certain tendency of the citizens to synchronise their votes to a mono-lingual or national group-result of "all or nobody". Maybe these actions were caused by a real national opinion, but it is also possible that the individual voting behaviour was, to a certain extent, a function of the group dynamic based on an anticipated group effect rather than on individual balancing of pros and cons.

As described in the evaluation report of the First Citizen's Convention, the "silent" voting by using the voting-pads needs clear and transparent instructions. In comparison to the Second Citizen's Convention, the pad voting had the advantage, that the expression of the individual opinion was not visible for the other citizens. As a result, effects of social pressure on the voting were nearly impossible. Additionally, the voting by hand seemed to create more efforts concerning the counting of votes. The pad-counting was also more transparent by the projection of the voting results, what secured a better availability of the data in the process. It was also possible to combine voting-results with other data for an advanced presentation.

Some of the rules were not completely implemented. For instance, the rule that every citizen should present his own point of view in the discussion at the Central Table was not fully adopted by the partici-

pants. The members of the national tables evaluated the contributions of "their" representative in the Central Table and regarded themselves as watchdogs for a "national controlling" to assure that the contributions at the Central Table were in line with the national tables' deliberations.

At times, the Lead-Facilitator of Carousel 3 accelerated the voting procedure because of time constraints. In arrangement with the Plenary, he also modified the form of the discussion process, which caused some irritation among the participants.

As mentioned above, the interaction between the Monolingual and Central Table basically worked well, but the variant developed during the process turned out to be very efficient alternative. The "central discussion" was developed in the process as a variant to the discussion at the Central Table. This change animated the interaction among the citizens and provided more opportunities for interactions between the Facilitator and the citizens. The intense interactions increased the commitment among all persons involved compared to the "standard procedure" of the Central Table, which implied a more inactive role for the participants at the Monolingual Tables. Basically, the participation and inclusion of the citizens in the process as well as the close interaction of all persons involved can be seen as central determinants of the positive outcome with respect to the process. Interaction is efficient.

The Main-Facilitators of the Plenary and of the Carousels played a central role in the discussions and led the interactions. He or she was asked to summarize the contributions but also had the task of instructing and motivating the citizens. In view of the narrow time frame, one major task of the Main-Facilitator was to keep the strict timetable and to structure the discussions accordingly. The observation noted that the progress was gained at the expense of the quality of the discourse.

The Facilitators played a dominant role in the process. For example, the contributions of the citizens at the Central Table were often presented more to the Facilitator than to the other members of the group.

The citizens tried to communicate and to interact with the other participants, but a real discourse was often impeded due to process rules and timing orders. The discussions were more lively in the Carousel Plenary and the European Café as the structure was less rigid there.

The main problem was the immense time pressure, which often decreased the possibilities to respond to the demands, ideas and suggestions of the citizens in a timely fashion. The leadership of the Facilitator often had to concentrate on keeping time instead of structuring the discussion. The methodological design was based on a high amount of dense working phases, which were only separated by smaller time buffers and breaks. The process was designed with the flaw of putting too much time pressure on the interactions, which turned out to be a major shortcoming.

The commitment of the citizens was basically high. They were motivated to produce a considerable result. The long working days challenged the physical condition of all participants, some of them well advanced in years. The parts of the discussion that left most citizens inactive increased this effect.

The tiredness of the citizens caused several, sometimes contradicting effects. On the one hand, the tired citizens were more insistent and less relaxed or patient. On the other hand, the behaviour of the participants became more passive, the commitment decreased and it appeared that they wanted to finish the session as fast as possible. These dual types of behaviour and attitudes interacted with a lot of other factors, such as the self-image of citizens with respect to their perceived role as active or passive contributor or to the personal interest in the subject.

Basically, the activity and the interaction in the discussions were heavily influenced by the degree of fatigue. Some citizens slept, were busy with other activities or had private conversations. A few citizens left the Carousel finally or they stepped outside for a short break. This also occurred during the voting. It wasn't always obvious whether the citizens found their decision focused on the content or simply because they wanted only to get "it done". This situation was

not optimal. Nevertheless, citizens did occasionally raise an objection against a voting result. This shows, at least, some vigilance during the voting procedures. At all times there were always a few participants who even followed the discussion during inactive phases. It can be assumed that these participants would have further activated the other members of the table if some "problematic" issues had been selected. So, the process obviously didn't run optimally, but there was never the danger of collapse or a direct danger for the results.

The time problem was known before the Convention started. A lot of persons in charge mentioned it in their initial speeches as one of the central challenges of the process. It can be assumed that the methodological decision for the design resulted from the practical need of having a result in a short time period.

A four-day-convention-design is more expensive, but the process would have benefited from the additional time. One possible problem with adding a day could have been the availability of citizens for such a long time period. It might have also been difficult to find an optimal date for all citizens to meet. One solution for this problem could be to constitute "fluid panels", which consists of much more citizens than are needed for the European meetings so that enough representatives of the panel can participate every time.

Another possibility would be to organize several parallel European meetings, but this would be related with more expenses. The alternative to the direct modification of the Convention design would be to transfer some of the convention-work-packages to the national meetings in advance. One special preparation meeting could be used for a detailed introduction of the panellists so that they come to better terms with the procedures of the Convention.

Similar to the First Citizen's Convention, the citizens often needed time to adjust to the process. This also applied to the other persons involved, despite of the impression that the staff members were well instructed for their work and seemed to be much better involved into the project than during the First Citizens Convention.

Sometimes persons responsible were irritated. Small irregularities and interruptions occurred during the process, which can be seen as consequences of the complexity and the sophisticated structuring of the process. Small incidents for instance, regarding the microphone system, disturbed the process.

The incidents influenced the participants indirectly on a symbolical level. If the persons in charge – as symbolical leaders of a strong regulated process – are irritated, in stress or if the process does not run even through it has to run because of the limited time, this can not motivate the participants and the situation gradually leads to reservation of the citizens.

The support team and especially the Lead-Facilitators used these incidents to recognize crucial points of interaction and communication and they suggested quick and efficient solutions for improvement. This constituted an impression of professionalism and control. It is crucial to have professional, experienced and committed staff at hand to deal with unavoidable incidents and surprises.

It is useful and necessary, that the designers of the process offer a systematic scheduling and solid role definitions as well as clear process rules to all persons involved. It is also an important point to consider how many details the participants and the persons in charge are able to remember in live situation.

The process and the interactions were characterized by a high extent of complexity and the observation team detected a transparency problem of the process and procedures. The citizens didn't exactly know what their task in the working segment was and where the actual working phase was located in the entire process. For example, during Friday evening, the citizens of Carousel 3 didn't expect another elaboration session for an issue was scheduled for them. They were fully surprised by this fact and their commitment almost collapsed. The information regarding the tasks and procedures was given in advance, but obviously it didn't reach all citizens or it was

ignored in the flood of material. Sometimes elements of the process were changed without communication of the reasons and new rules were introduced without explaining their rationale.

The complexity of the elaborated methodological system aggravated the transparency problem. The participants had no overview of the most important design features and it was not definitely clear to the citizens, which rule would fit to the situation. The process was explained by doing it. But the irritations and the small irregularities as well as the ad-hoc adaptations made the procedures appear arbitrary and "fluid". The situation created uncertainties for everybody and it was often necessary to explain the rules again to the citizens, who were not always satisfied with the mead hoc explanations given to them, nor with the general methodological actualities. For example, the citizens were surprised by the methodological decision to elaborate only 2 Issues per Theme. A discussion about methodological issues was not possible in view of the time pressure. The general situation increasingly produced reservations in the Plenary.

The problem with transparency converged with another problem concerning the translation. The interpreters played a central role in the process, because they transmitted the contributions among and between all persons involved. But the absolute necessary employment of the interpreters also increased the complexity by an additional level of interaction. The problem occurred when the process ran too fast for the translators to keep up with the speed of the process. Several citizens, but also the interpreters of Carousel 3, criticized the speed and inability to provide effective translation more than once. Additionally, some citizens expressed their feeling about statements not being translated correctly.

The participants had to wait until a translation was finished. This decreased their opportunity to react immediately to the content or the decisions. Mostly the citizens stayed cooperative and accepted the methodological constraints, but that didn't mean that they were satisfied with them. It can be assumed, that this situation led to dissatisfaction and inactivity. Beside the procedural actualities, the partici-

pants often had to reflect on an extensive amount of working material and content. This created additional stress.

It is to document that the visualisation of the discussed content was improved during the process, but it needed some time to find an optimal presentation style in form of the PPT-slides. An adequate visualisation of content and its changes obviously reduced the complexity and enriched the process. One important aspect was the synchronisation of all actors. A close cooperation between the Facilitator, the citizens and the support team increased transparency and efficiency.

A meaningful rule regarding the incorporation of citizens' contributions into the visual material (slides) would have been, that every statement could have been completed with a short summary directly submitted to the notes. So the speaker as well as every other person involved could share the same basis of meaning and terminology and the texts could have been kept shorter. Additionally, the different contributions and changes could have been highlighted and denoted by their origin until being fully accepted by the Plenary.

The visualisation of the content was presented in English which some of the citizens were not able to read and understand. The reflection of this problem led to the basic alternative suggestion to give the responsibility of translation of the central slides into national language to the citizens of the national tables. This would have improved the visibility of the content directly at the tables. The central slides with the English statements could have been used as the "official" base and reference for the process. The citizens would have been placed closer to the content of the discussion with this design addition. Their responsibility to provide translation at the National Tables would have given them a more active role in the process all of the time and they would have actively participated in the writing process, which provides an important factual and symbolical surplus. This idea is related to some technical needs, because every national table must then be equipped with a laptop etc., but the final outcome would compensate for all these efforts. The translation of the recommenda-

tions for the national meetings could proceed faster by just checking the notes of the national tables.

A deeper participation of all citizens in the writing process would have also increased transparency. With the experience of the Convention, the question needs to be addressed: If the citizens were responsible for the final results, why didn't they get more responsibility in the process?

The presentations of content remained faulty. Some formulations were not written down clearly, distinct entries were pooled together while other almost identical inputs were treated as separate items. The citizens were sometimes unable to identify the meaning of the message or the source of the information or they didn't recognize "their" statements. This created frustration and criticism by the participants. Additionally the participants had the impression that the writing process didn't proceed smoothly, probably due to organizational problems. In contrast to the First Convention, there was no official manifest unit in the process like the Theme Team which was responsible for the content and could have taken care of the information input, what was also an important symbolical function. The content was integrated by note-taking activity during the Second Convention. Those notes disappeared after the closure of each session so that citizens had no further access to them. Such a fragmented information handling demanded blind trust by the citizens.

The crisis situation that occurred on Sunday can be seen as the culminating result of the growing dissatisfaction with the process. The crisis proceeded in several distinct stages. In the storming phase, the citizens expressed their frustration and their dissatisfaction, letting off the steam that had been accumulated during the entire process.

The second phase could be summarized as critical restoration. In this phase citizens demanded the improvement of the slides which had been presented during the Plenary Session. The citizens were convinced that the slides did not match the entries prepared in the Carousels. The texts in the slides had been shortened, some contributions of the citizens seemed to be missing or the participants didn't recog-

nize their statements. These problems partially resulted from the process of editing the original entries to make them suitable for a summary presentation to the Plenary. The citizens didn't accept this editing. The citizens also expressed their feeling of unease with the overall procedure as also with the methodological actualities.

The participants invested a lot of energy into the project and they were requested to sign the final report. The Plenary provided the last opportunity for the citizens to check the produced output of all Carousels. Not making the editing process clear to all participants left the impression that the organisers were more interested in getting a presentable result than producing a truthful reflection of what the citizens had to say.

The objections do indicate the great commitment of the citizens as well as their high self-confidence. But the objections also led to the assumption that the citizens followed another rationality then the process did. As described above, the process was orientated to efficiency and progress. From perspective of the methodological design the discussion of all Issues per Theme was not possible and the objective of the process was a result what was "good enough". The results and the discussion process had an own value for the citizens and they cared for the quality of the output. Their expectations were probably directed by the National Synthesis Report. The persons in charge stressed several times, that the concrete terminology of the output is a secondary target of the process. Special terms and expressions were important for the citizens and it supplied the process when the persons in charge picked up the language as well as the formulations of the participants.

In the calming phase, several citizens and persons responsible made suggestions how to carry on with the process. Some protest statements were contributed, but the discussion gradually produced a new base of trust for the proceeding. Symbolical acts like the excuse of the Lead-Facilitator were important aspects of the interaction. The common decision to proceed with the process, no matter which problems were related to it, was legitimised by a voting, which can be

interpreted as important legitimisation of all the results. The expression of the citizen's perspective was a stressful experience but supplied the process and the results by the ventilation of the emotional loads and reservations of the competent participants. The Plenary and the discussion were strengthened by this crisis.

The commitment of everybody, especially the commitment of the citizens was proved in the final elaboration phase. The Plenary had to regain the time, which had been invested for the clarification of the process issues. The performance of every person involved was great and the process was completed nearly in time.

The interaction between the citizens and the experts was generally constructive and trustful. Both actor groups were interested in listening, understanding and in the reflection of the arguments of "the other side". This exchange can be seen as an important outcome of the Convention, which can effect indirect effects. The contributions of the experts enriched the knowledge of the citizens, but it can be assumed that the participation was also a profitable experience for the experts. It is a methodological question, how much influence of the experts is accepted. The observation detected that the resource persons had direct influence on the content, for instance by suggesting of recommendations. One possible design alternative could be to open the process for an direct discussion between citizens and experts.

An additional outcome of the process was that the entire ECD-Project definitely constituted a common European identity and a "European citizenship" within the project. The participants sometimes conducted difficult discussions. This was no surprise in view of the subject brain science, which is unexplored not only socially and which offers some controversial potential. Despite national differences, the European participants commonly developed the report and they generally interacted in an open, communicational way focused on agreement.

The participants were basically highly committed during the elaboration of content, but they also defended the results of their work. It was a methodological decision and an obvious difference to the First

Convention that the national level of discussion was strengthened in the Second Citizen's Convention, what limited the possibilities for the citizens to participate in an European discourse. On the other hand, the processes initiated a common European activity and consciousness regarding the results, which also indicated that the citizens are competent partners, who take full responsibility for their contributions. This finding can be counted to the most important experiences of the project.

The organization of the Convention was excellent. In view of the mass of actors and the complexity of the undertaking, the logistical process ran without problems. The process was supplied magnificently, which was a result of enormous efforts of the support team, but especially of the staff of the King Baudouin Foundation.

2   Interviews

2.1   Methods and Approach

The evaluation team collected information about the Convention process by means of the observation. The team members additionally interviewed key actors in order to gain a realistic picture of the expectations, assessments and perceptions of all actors involved.

The Facilitators implemented the methodological design and acted as intermediaries between the organizers and the participants during the Convention. They occupied an important position in commenting and judging the interactions that they had conducted. So, six "main interviews" with Facilitators respectively with the coordination team members of the King Baudouin Foundation were conducted. Beside the stakeholders, who occupied quasi an external perspective (4 interviews) 3 citizens got the opportunity to present their perspectives. The interviews took place immediately in the aftermath of the Second Citizens' Convention or shortly after the event. The interviews were mainly conducted via telephone but sometimes also in a face-to-face conversation.

From a methodological viewpoint the method used for the interviews can be grouped among the qualitative instruments of issue-oriented semi-structured exploration. All interviews were recorded digitally or by tape.

The "short interviews" consisted of 7 open questions and focused aspects like the assessment of the success or the influence of the ECD-Project respectively of the Convention. The "main interviews" consisted of 18 open questions and focused additional assessments of the methodological design. Some of the major topics covered in the interviews referred to:

- What are the main objectives of the ECD-Project from the perspective of the interviewed person and was the convention perceived as successful in regard to these objectives?

- Do the expectations correspond with the final impressions of the interviewed person?

- How did the respondents assess the process for instance regarding the efficiency or the design?

- How did the respondents describe their personal role in this process; how did they attempt to meet this role and did they feel well prepared for conducting their respective tasks?

- What kind of problems were actually perceived and what kind of problems are expected in the future?

- Were they convinced that the ECD-Project was able to facilitate an European identity amongst the citizens and how did they describe the atmosphere of the Convention?

- How did the key actors perceive the degree of commitment of the citizens' as well as their (discourse-) competence?

- In regard to the methodology: How did the respondents judge the approach of the ECD-Project to incorporate science in the ECD-Project and how did they evaluate the methods that were used to meet the purpose of the whole exercise? Were they satisfied with the methods of citizen involvement?

- Did they believe that every citizen had gotten a fair opportunity to contribute to the process and to the results?

- How did they assess and evaluate the role of the King Baudouin Foundation?

- The interviewees were also asked to give an estimation regarding the influence of the ECD-Project on the society and the policy.

At the beginning of the interviews all of the respondents received information about the intentions of the interview and a rough outline of the issues that would be addressed during the interview. The interviewers also assured the respondents that all answers were kept confidential.

2.2   Interviews - Results

2.2.1   Major Objectives of the ECD-Project

Internal Perspective

The perceptions of the major objectives mentioned by Facilitators and organisers were similar in key aspects. They stressed the objective to provide recommendations and the citizen's perspective to decision-makers and scientists, how to handle the new found knowledge on brain sciences.

Another major target was to create the opportunities for citizens to participate in a European dialog and to reflect on an issue that would have an effect on the whole society, like brain sciences in the ECD-Project. For this reason, it had to be developed a new method as a framework for the discussion between the European citizens. The design also should involve experts to secure a professional input.

The interviewees mentioned that it was important to demonstrate that common interests and values do exist between the European citizens. The citizens from different European countries were able to develop a common point of view about this complex issue.

The project was a good exercise of democracy and participation. The interviewed persons mentioned, that they would like participating in other projects such as Meeting of Minds, to constitute more opportunities for the citizens. The interviewees also wanted to create instru-

ments to secure the implementation of the process results. In the eyes of the interviewed actors, the ECD-Project facilitated a new awareness of democracy.

External Perspective

All interviewed stakeholders agreed on the definition of the prime objective, their positions only diverged regarding 'secondary' aspects. They perceived the consultation of citizens on scientific issues as the prime objective. It was considered as an important contribution for the social control, the acceptance and the legitimacy of technology, especially concerning the funding of brain science, to get an unbiased public position on brain science – citizens' feelings, knowledge and expectations. The "social demand" was stressed as another relevant factor.

One stakeholder differentiated the objective into two dimensions: First, the objective was a procedural one: the ECD-Project was the test of a method to consult the European public. Second, the objective was a substantial one: to get to know the public's opinions, assessments and fears as well as their demands of regulation. The expert rated both dimensions as equally important and considered it a major challenge to find a balance between process and content. In the interviewees opinion the content seemed to be dominated sometimes by questions of process.

As secondary objectives the stakeholders mentioned providing the latest scientific findings to the public; the constitution of a dialog between European citizens; and creating networks between the relevant actors.

Citizens

The answers of the interviewed citizens differed. Some mentioned that discussing the differences and commonalities between their national perspectives at the European level was the most important object. Other participants stressed the involvement of the public in

scientific issues to get to know citizens' hopes, worries and opinions concerning the future of brain research. There was also mention of strengthening the publicity of brain science in general by this event. The publicity could have an impact on the general conditions of research and on the funding of brain sciences.

2.2.2   Evaluation of the Success of the Project

Internal Perspective

The ECD-Project was generally assessed as a success.

Interviewed persons lauded the possibility given by the ECD-Project enabling European citizens regarding an important issue, that affects all of them. The ECD-Project demonstrated successfully that citizens from different countries are able to deal with a complex issue in a cross-national dialog.

Despite the long period of time, the citizens supported the single process-steps in which they were included. Finally, they developed a common statement for policy-makers and scientists, about how to deal with key questions concerning brain sciences. This also illustrated the common shared values by the citizens concerning the discussed issues.

Referring to the influence of the ECD-Project for the future, interviewed persons pointed out, that the project was not finished yet, and that the following stages were also very important: to discuss the recommendations with stakeholders at European and national level and to gain an impact by this.

Considering these findings, interviewed persons were in overall satisfied with the results of the second convention. But critical aspects concerning the process were also mentioned. The lack of transparency during the voting process and during the writing process was one of the most criticised elements of the process.

External Perspective

All in all, the experts evaluated the ECD-Project as a success. They testified that the undertaking provided an important European exchange of the citizens, who gained the experience of the development of a real European citizenship. The experts also considered the citizens' recommendations in the final report as a valuable result.

Some stakeholders made restrictions concerning this assessment. They stressed the high financial costs of this project and mentioned that the citizens' major ethical concerns were not always clear to them at all times.

Divergent valuations regarding the relation between the experts and the citizens existed in the group of interviewees. Some actors appreciated the clear and beneficial change of roles. The scientists, who usually gave the lectures, listened to the public. Other experts stated that the citizens depended strongly on expert's help and support to come to their positions.

Citizens

The citizens commonly described the outcome as a success of the best possible rate. A successful aspect they perceived that the learning and sharing of standpoints worked very well, despite different cultural backgrounds. The realization of the report was also mentioned as a decisive element of success. The interviewed citizens also thought that the most panellists agreed on the report and argued that, even with much more time, it would have been impossible to achieve an over all consensus.

2.2.3   Results and Expectations:

Internal Perspective

Different arguments came up, concerning the evaluation of the results in comparison to the expectations. In general, the internal actors were satisfied with the outcome. They evaluated the recommendations as a good result of the discussions and emphasised, that some statements were well elaborated. The interviewees appreciated the involvement of the citizens in an European discussion process. Some interviewed persons also mentioned frustration regarding the problem, that the elaborated results of the national discussions were not completely transferred to the European level. Some citizens expected this. Another critical aspect mentioned was the writing process. This topic will be later presented in detail.

Table 1: Summary of Objectives, Success and Expected Results

	Internal Perspective	External Perspective	Citizens
Main objectives	• Development of recommendations for decision makers based on the citizen's perspective • Opportunity for the citizens to discuss brain science on European level together with other citizens and experts	• Prime objective: Consulting citizens on scientific issues • Important contribution for social control, legitimacy, and acceptance of technology • The ECD – Project provided an unbiased public position on brain science	• Discussion at European level • Involvement of the public (citizen's opinions) regarding scientific issues • Publicity effect on funding and on conditions of research

	• Development of a method for the dialog • Demonstration of shared values and interests between citizens of European countries by development of a common statement on brain science • The ECD-Project was a good exercise of democracy and participation	• One Stakeholder: There were two dimensions to balance: the procedural and the substantial. Sometimes process-dimension dominated the content-dimension during the ECD-Project • Provided the latest scientific findings to the public • Constituted of a dialog between European citizens • Creating networks between actors	
Success	• The project was a success • Citizens were able to deal with an complex issue over national boarders and over a long time • Citizens developed a common European statement on Brain Science, which is	• The project was a success • Construction of an European citizenship • Recommendations of the citizens were a valuable result • Critique: High financial costs of the project • Critique: Major	• The project was a success • Successful learning and sharing of standpoints despite different cultural backgrounds • Realization of the report was a success • Overall consen-

	also an indication of commonly shared values • Dependency of the success from the question how the method can be used in other contexts • Lack of transparency during the voting and writing process	ethical concerns of the citizens were not at the time clearly to see • Divergent perceptions of the process: Successful change of roles between scientists and citizens, Experts listened vs. Citizens' strong dependence on experts' support	sus not achievable
Expected Results	• Expectations were fulfilled • Satisfaction with the outcome • Frustration of the citizens regarding the transfer of the deep elaborated national results to the European discussion • The writing process must be improved		

2.2.4   Evaluation of the Convention-Process

Internal perspective

The evaluation of the Second Convention was divided into two parts, the effective elements and the ineffective elements.

The ineffective elements were characterised by the following aspects: First, the transfer problem mentioned. Most interviewees mentioned, some citizens were disappointed regarding lost aspects, which were discussed on national level, but not transferred to the European-level. So the citizens had the feeling of losing some important national aspects.

Second, the interviewees criticised that the process of making amendments in the end of the Convention had not been transparent enough. This process-step was characterized as very complex. Additionally, a lot of citizens used the amendment to change the meaning of some recommendations completely.

Third, all interviewed persons criticised the writing process, which was reasoned by the fact, that the writing team had changed the formulation of the text to much. The citizens didn't recognize what they had contributed in the sessions before. One special aspect was that the terminology of the citizens wasn't used in the texts. Finally, the citizens lost the confidence in the process.

The writing team was also not sufficiently incorporated into the Carousels. This also was the case in Carousel 3. The interviewees suggested integrating the writing team more into the process to keep the right meaning of the discussed arguments.

Fourth, the internal actors criticised the lack of a "real European-exchange" during the discussions at the Central Table. The problem was the imbalance between the national and the European-level respectively that the design of the Central Table Discussion structurally didn't support the development of a real discourse. The internal actors suggested to use formats of the first Convention for the second one, too.

Fifth, the extremely high stress level caused problems. The citizens always had to be productive, what was criticised as being too difficult. The interviewed persons proposed to give more time to the citizens for private conversations. They added that it was also important to have time to enjoy the European feeling.

Sixth, the very complex situation with there being different languages caused notable challenges. Some persons criticised the consecutive translation. Simultaneous translation made it impossible to control, whether the sentences had been interpreted in the correct way. The translators needed time to make sure that their translation was correct. Furthermore, it was suggested to allocate the translators near by the discussing citizens to enable more direct contact and more feedback about the correct wording.

The last critical point was the very narrow timetable.

The engagement of all participants was positively assessed. The professional presentation by the citizens in the European-parliament was highlighted. The collaboration between the different organisational actors was also evaluated positively.

The dialog between the citizens and the experts worked very well. It was important to instruct the experts of how to communicate with the citizens, which was especially related to a friendly and open-minded way of interaction. The citizens gained profound knowledge, which was characterized as an additional positive outcome of the process.

The interviewees also commended the spontaneous party in the Sunday evening. They mentioned, that it was very important and quite good to celebrate the hard work. The drawing exercise was seen as another highlight of the process. Many persons gave the Graphic-Facilitator a very positive feedback on his drawings, which supplied the integration between the citizens.

The interviewed persons also stressed, that the experiences of the First Citizens' Convention especially concerning the question of, how to deal with a crisis situation, supplied the process.

2.2.5   Evaluation of the Carrousel Method as Central Design

Internal Perspective

The interviewed persons assessed the Carousel design differently. One positive aspect of the method was the possibility to negotiating the results quickly in a multilingual way. The methodology was evaluated as an adequate and efficient procedure to produce recommendations and to establish possibilities of participation. They pointed out that the Carousels came to different qualitatively conclusions and that it was difficult synchronising the results from the three Carrousels. The method was, in sum, implemented very well.

On the other hand, critical opinions were also expressed. One important argument referred to the lack of a real European discussion. Citizens at the tables often did not discuss interactively. They only made single statements and the Carousel-Facilitator had the responsibility of summarizing all statements. So, interviewed persons suggested thinking about other new methods which could be combined with the just developed ECD-Method to enhance the direct dialog between the citizens. Therefore it was suggested to schedule more time for the discussions between citizens from different countries. All persons involved, including Facilitators, writers and citizens, suffered from the lack of time and with the lack of flexibility.

The interviewees suggested to strengthening the European level of discourse by conducting more mixed tables of European citizens. Additionally, the interpreters could join these tables to gain real dis-

cussion. The discussion should also be characterised by funny elements.

2.2.6   Role Description and Implementation

Internal Perspective

The interviewed persons described their roles in different ways. Some were only focused on one role, others had to deal with several roles. The Plenary-Facilitator felt responsible for a smooth flow of the process and it's sessions. But he also had to work as a designer of the process and had to work closely with the method group. The Carousel-Facilitators described their role as mediator between citizens and as a supporter for the Lead-Facilitator. Basically, it was emphasized, that the teamwork between Facilitators worked especially well.

One of the Facilitators mentioned that they had a complex task: It was important to stay focused and self-possessed, especially when things went wrong in the process. The close cooperation between all persons in charge was mentioned as essential for coping with all of the challenges and gathering important information. In the situation on Sunday, it was important to stay permanently informed how long the translators will support the process to make the right decisions for finishing the process in time. Another main task was to cope with the different national and cultural styles of interaction and personalities to ensure a positive climate during the discussions between citizens. The Facilitators had to focus on every single person and their specific way of participating. Some citizens discussed lively while others needed motivation. So the Facilitators had to interact very perspicuously. The Facilitators had also to follow the development of content attentively. Another task for the Facilitators was to centralise the outcome. Furthermore, they had to moderate the communication between the citizens and the Support Team, to ensure that every single argument had been written down. The Facilitators mentioned that

unfortunately this central element didn't work well. The problems sometimes occurred because of the missing cooperation between Facilitator and writers.

The Coordinators described their role as very complex: they had to organize the method group, prepare the contents that had to be discussed, try to find a suitable team for the jobs and they had to support the writing process of the report.

All of the interviewed persons indicated that they were well prepared for their tasks of the convention.

Table 2: Role-perception, evaluations of process and central design

	Internal Perspective
Evaluation of the process of the 2nd Convention	• Disappointment by the citizens about some lost aspects on national level due to the aggregation of the most important aspects on European level. • The process of making amendments in the end of the Convention was not transparent enough • The writing team changed the formulation of the text to much • Lack of a "real European-exchange" during the discussions at the Central Table • The citizens always had to be productive, what was criticised as too hard • Simultaneous translation made it impossible to control, that sentences were interpreted in the correct way • Very narrow timetable in general • The engagement of all participants was positively assessed
	• The professional presentation in the European-Parliament by the citizens was highlighted • The collaboration between the different organisational actors was evaluated positively • The dialog between the citizens and the experts worked very well

Evaluation of the Carrousel Method as central design	• The methodology was evaluated as adequate and efficient procedure to produce recommendations and to establish possibilities of participation • Carousels came to qualitatively different conclusions and it was difficult to synchronise the results • Lack of a real European discussion • The interviewees suggested to strengthen the European level of discourse by conducting more mixed tables of European citizens by integrating the translators direct on the tables to ensure also a correct translation.
Role description and role implementation	• The Plenary-Facilitator felt responsible for a smooth flow of the process and it's sessions. • The Plenary-Facilitator had also to work as a designer of the process and worked closely with the method group • The Carousel-Facilitators described their role as mediator between citizens and also as supporter for the Lead-Facilitator • The Coordinators described their role as very complex. They had to organize the method group, prepare the contents that had to be discussed, try to find a suitable team for the jobs and realise the report. • All of the interviewed persons indicated that they were very well prepared for their tasks of the Convention.

2.2.7   Main Problems

Internal Perspective

The problems mentioned by the internal actors included aspects referring to the process, but also to the content. The high expectations among the citizens regarding the results of the convention were not met completely, which caused disappointment among them. This problem was described above as a transfer problem of the discussed issues from the national level to the European level. The internal actors mentioned that some citizens had the feeling of making steps backward.

Another serious problem was the narrow time frame. There was not enough time to discuss several aspects in detail during the Carrousel sessions, which caused dissatisfaction of the citizens. The participants needed more time to understand different perspectives, which was only given during the discussions at the Central Table.

The citizens also suffered from the lack of breaks. The amount of stress and pressure and the high density of working phases led to dissatisfaction. The interviewees suggested to choose specific issues and not to discuss all dimensions. It would have been necessary to schedule more time for creating a relaxed atmosphere, which would have also allowed private conversations.

The writing process was another problem that led to frictions. The citizens were not convinced, that their statements were recorded correctly. The reformulations of statements effected negatively, too. It was an essential factor for the citizens to maintain the original wording of their arguments in the written text. Only by this mean could they identify with the results. The internal actors suggested to increase the transparency of the processes, too.

Misunderstandings also arose from translation problems. The meaning of the words was not always translated correctly. Different meanings of the words sometimes led to a wrong interpretation of statements.

The voting process was one major problem. The rules of the voting were unclear and improper and were changed a few times after the first day without informing the citizens about the reasons and the meaning of the new rules. This increased the distrust of the citizens. The second problem concerning the voting was the lack of privacy. The interviewees suggested to anonymously vote to avoid effects of group pressure. The citizens were especially influenced during the last voting on Sunday, because the individual decisions seemed to be related to the membership to one national table.

Other challenges were mentioned concerning the integration of stakeholders. The involvement of research and science community

was easier than to involving the public policy makers, who should have also been involved.

External Perspective

The assessment of problems during the ECD varied strongly between the members of the actor group. The different types of problems had diverging perceptions concerning the severity and the possibilities of avoiding.

Not many stakeholders detected problems, while considering the enormous framework of the undertaking. The problems mentioned by the other actors can be grouped into three fields. Several stakeholders perceived it to be a major problem to achieve an 'equality of understanding', which means not all national groups were immediately able to follow what happened at every moment of the process, despite of the good quality of the translation. In between the various languages, English was clearly the dominant code, which led to frustration and mistrust. If the people were not able to understand English, it was a question of confidence to reduce the fear of the own positions getting lost, as well as the fear of manipulation. Stakeholders emphasized the fact that differences in language are linked to cultural differences in thinking and writing. The interviewees stressed that there were not only mere translation problems to deal with but also more profound cultural differences in perceptions and approaches. One language cannot always 'simply' be translated into another one, there are specific culturally grounded meanings going along with the wording.

There were two problems concerning the 'methodological setting'. First, interviewees perceived the work of the citizens as too isolated, which means, that there existed a lack of external input. They suggested more exchange with members of the pharmaceutical industry or other institutions to allow more conflict and constructive confrontation that could enrich and anchor the citizens' debate. Second, the

whole process was evaluated as too roughly structured and that it lacked flexibility.

Third, there were problems seen in the relation between citizens and experts. This concerned the roles and the qualifications of both groups. On one hand, there were knowledge gaps throughout the citizens, e.g. about regulations that had already been existing. One expert estimated one cannot cope with knowledge gaps even by investing more time. On the other hand, the question of the expert's role arose. How can one intervene as an expert without influencing or dominating the public?

In total, experts had little to say about the coping with these problems, because they saw themselves more as external observers than as persons involved. As far as the scientist-citizen relation was concerned, one expert stressed the fact of strongly varying expert quality and different abilities of experts to adapt to the role of the resource persons.

Citizens

As to problems, citizens agreed that ECD worked well. They mentioned being conscious about the fact, that ECD was a pilot and designed to learn from its problems.

The interviewees detected concrete problems. One is the fact that English-speakers and non English-speakers were not in equal positions. The latter were not sure, if their impact was fully addressed, despite the high quality of the translation. This lack of the equal understanding was figured out to be the source of the crisis of the Second Convention. The crisis was seen by the citizens as a good and necessary way of the recovery of trust.

The citizens also mentioned the problem of national groups not having enough time to work carefully through the papers provided by the writing groups, which mostly were only available in English. Some citizens needed time consuming translations of the papers into their own languages, these translations where given ad hoc by their

national Facilitators. The citizens recommended giving more time to assure that correctly translated papers are available for the different national groups, on one hand, and to give sufficient time for reading, on the other hand.

In general, the lack of time was seen as the major problem of the Convention. The citizens reported that they "raced" together with the organizers from room to room. One citizen recommended giving an extra day to manage the workload.

Another problematic aspect mentioned was the missing continuity between the different meetings. Especially the Second Convention was perceived as not being clearly based on the work that had been done before. Citizens felt that their work had gotten lost, which led to frustration. They tried to cope with this problem by communicating it to the organizers, who in turn tried to focus more on the national reports. But the process generally missed flexibility.

2.2.8   Expected Problems in the Future

Internal Perspective

The implementation of the results was mentioned as the most challenging problem for the future. The worry was expressed, that policy-makers did not actually take into account what the citizens recommended, because citizens were not officially legitimated. It was emphasised by the interviewees that the presentation of the results in the European Parliament should have been a starting point to introduce the citizens' ideas to policy-makers and to the European Commission. It should also have been made transparent for the citizens, what will happen with the results.

Other problems expected in future were budget problems. Concerning this topic, it was suggested to change the design by investing more time in the meetings on European level than in national level,

what additionally would enforce the European integration.

External Perspective

The experts focused on the possible re-application of the meeting of mind's method. The costs (also in time) and the complexity of the process were seen as obstacles of a regular application of this method and difficult to overcome. The interviewees argued that one had to look for methods that were easier to apply. They proposed to go further searching for more easy ways to bring lay people into discussion with experts. They stressed that methods had to be tested systematically and guided by criteria. It seemed more realistic to them to apply this method on restricted issues.

Citizens

The Citizens expected quite similar problems for the future, then existed in the past. The shortage of time appeared as the main problem. An investment of more time by the citizens was considered to be unrealistic.

One citizen emphasised a general tension in the mechanism of the citizen panel selection. It was also difficult to achieve a representative cross section of the population, because only those would participate, who were able to take the time.

Table 3: Problems and Problems in the future

	Internal Perspective	External Perspective	Citizens
Problems	• Difference between expectations of the citizens and the process as well as the results caused frustra-	• Diverging problem perceptions • No problems at all • 'Inequality of understanding'	• 'Inequality regarding the translation' led to an inequality of understanding • Papers available

	tion • Narrow time frame did not allow private conversation between the citizens. • Lack of transparency during the writing process • Problem regarding the correct translation • Lack of transparency and clarity concerning the rules of the voting process • Integration of policy-makers	• English as a dominant code leads finally to frustrations and to mistrust • Language problems were linked to more profound cultural differences in thinking that were not easily to overcome by translation. • Citizens were working to isolated, more contact (e.g. with actors from the pharmaceutical industry) would have been productive. • Process was too roughly structured (lack of flexibility) • Persisting knowledge gaps (citizens) • Expert role was difficult (tension between support and influence)	only in English were a problem for some groups, what needed support • Demand of more time to provide translated papers and to work them trough • General lack of time as main problem of the Convention • Missing continuity between the national and the second European meeting • Stronger focus on national reports required • Process missed flexibility
Future Problems	• The implementation of the results • The sufficient	• Costs (Money) • Time • Complexity	• Time as main structural problem

	consideration of the results by the policy-makers • Budget problems	• Need to (re)search for alternative methods	• Distortion of the Samples (self-selection mechanisms)

2.2.9   Facilitation of the European Identity

Internal Perspective

The ECD-Project facilitated and fostered European identity among the participants. Interviewed persons believed in the success of the project and had the feeling, that the citizens were also infected by the European spirit. Despite the problems discussed above, a first European feeling established as did an European identity among citizens from different countries.

It was also mentioned that it was necessary to have more time to develop the European feeling as it had been possible in the more relaxed time frame during the First Citizens' Convention. "It takes time to recognize, how others feel and think". This could also supply the cooperation and interaction during the discussions.

2.2.10   Commitment of the Citizens

Internal Perspective

Most of the citizens were very committed and the Facilitators, as the organizers, were very impressed by that fact. One actor mentioned: "They gave 120%". Although they worked under high time pressure, they stayed focused, elaborated the issues and recommendations and took the process extremely serious. They were also concerned about aspects of legitimacy of the process, which reflected a high awareness of democracy. In the eyes of the interviewees the citizens felt respon-

sible to participate. The internal actors stressed that it was an important experience for the citizens and that "Europe" is more than an economic process.

2.2.11   Preparation of the Citizens

Internal Perspective

The preparation of the citizens was evaluated in different ways. In comparison to the first Convention, they were absolutely well prepared for the discussions. They asked very complex and intelligent questions to the experts, which documented their deep knowledge on the subject brain sciences. The internal actors mentioned that the discussions between citizens and experts reflected a very high level of competence.

The interviewees detected differences between the national and the European level. On the national level, the citizens were well prepared and learned a lot, but they did not deal with the facts and circumstances from other countries enough. This not only held up the European process of the Convention, it also impeded the understanding of different positions and the possibility of developing a consensual wording etc..

Table 4: European Identity, Citizens' Commitment and Preparation

	Internal Perspective
European Identity	• The ECD-Project established a European feeling and European identity among citizens from different countries. • Time for private communication is necessary to develop a deeper and personal European-identity among the citizens • More European Exchange at the First Convention

Citizens' Commitment	• The citizens were very engaged and gave 120% • High level of concentration • They were strongly concerned on the legitimacy of the process • Citizens felt responsible to take part and to give their opinion for this reason
Preparation of Citizens	• Citizens were absolutely well prepared for the discussion, focus on national level • Not enough knowledge regarding the situation in other countries or the European-level

2.2.12   Atmosphere of the Convention

Internal Perspective

Some key words given by the interviewees reflected their assessment of the atmosphere during the Second Convention. They were very different, but mostly positive "committed, professional, exhausting, cheerful, proud, anger, serious, focused, friendly and cooperative". So the atmosphere was generally characterised as good, but the voting process especially led to dissatisfaction and some citizens even became very angry.

It was suggested to integrate more festive elements in the design, for example by using the European Cafe.

External Perspective

The atmosphere was described as very positive. Many stakeholders emphasized the strong citizen's commitment and stressed the energetic European spirit.

A further aspect that had an impact on the atmosphere of the convention, was the high importance that was assigned to the ECD-Project. Stakeholders were committed in a very personal way. They reported

that the experience was "unique, stimulating and enlightening". The project changed their ways of considering the lay public.

Citizens

Citizens described the atmosphere of the Second European Convention as good. Nevertheless, they reported that the First European Convention was more convivial. They regretted that they had not enough time for the European exchange.

But the citizens gave enthusiastic feedbacks on the ECD-Project as a personal experience. The project was described as a tremendous opportunity and fascinating pioneer work, that really opened up their minds.

2.2.13   Incorporation of Sciences into the ECD-Project

Internal Perspective

Different points of view were expressed. In general, the management of bringing the experts in the process was evaluated as good, the benefit of this action as high. Timing, positioning and the quality of the expert-input was evaluated as good and well balanced. The interviewees criticised the danger of influence or domination of the process by the scientists. Although it was necessary to include them during the discussions, the scientists expressed their point of view. The internal actors objected to the diverging quality of the experts regarding the competence to communicate their contributions and the interviewees criticised that the scientific disciplines had been unequally represented.

Another problem mentioned was the lack of "real European experts". Most of them were experts on a national level only, but not on European level.

External Perspective

The stakeholders themselves assessed the timing of bringing experts in as successful and appropriate. The selection of experts, who were able to communicate with lay public, was overall successful, but this ability strongly varied with personal qualities.

An important point of critique made by several scientists was the biased selection of experts, which did not represent the scientific community and which had led to a strong overweight of neuroscientists in comparison to the small minority of social scientists. This relation should have been more balanced.

Citizens

The citizens agreed that the expert support presented a sufficient and good base for their work. As timing was concerned, there were diverging opinions. For one citizen, scientists should not have been present from the beginning of the national meeting because the citizens needed time to get to know each other and the later step-by-step involvement of the experts was appreciated as beneficial. On the contrary, another citizen stated that experts should not have been present at the Second Convention and that they should have made their last intervention at the national meetings. For this citizen, the experts had become too dominant towards the end, which led to a recommendation that clearly came from an expert. The citizens also stressed the importance of the discussion and mutual information in between citizens, without experts. As to substantial questions, they suggested more expert comments on the national reports to be adequately informed about already existing measures.

Overall, one can assume that citizens desired clearer roles to guarantee their impact on the recommendations. This would mean 'more

experts' for comments and information on the status quo on one hand, but 'fewer experts' during the formulation of recommendations.

2.2.14   The Opportunity to Contribute

Internal Perspective

The Facilitators and organizers expressed their impression that the citizens had a fair and equal opportunity to contribute to the discussions. But several critical points were mentioned. One problem was the narrow time frame. Interviewed persons suggested to focus the process on the most important themes to discuss them more in detail.

Furthermore it was pointed out, that the final report had not been completed by the citizens themselves, which led to irritations and distrust, because the wording had been changed to much, and citizens didn't recognise their wording in the results. This argument was connected to the problems regarding the formulation of content and the translation problems described above.

The complexity of the process, especially on Sunday afternoon, was very high and there was a lack of transparency and visibility. These factors cumulated to the crises, during which the Citizens demanded transparency regarding the procedures and especially regarding the content. This reflected how serious citizens took the whole process.

Furthermore, the translators had problems with the high speed of the discussions and with the complexity. The time pressure in this phase was very counterproductive and increased the number of translation problems. The internal actors mentioned that the correct translation was one of the key elements for positive and constructive team work between the citizens as well as between all persons involved.

External Perspective

The Citizens' opportunity to contribute was evaluated in diverging ways. Some stakeholders saw absolutely fair and equal possibilities of participation, others made certain limitations. One constraint concerned the internal group dynamics, where there had been rather dominant or more silent members. The latter got smaller chances participating and to contributing to the result.

Another limitation was the selection of the citizen panel itself, i.e. there was a 'self-selection-mechanism' of the panel detected by one expert, what meant that instead of the officially stressed random selection, only those citizens participated, who were not only interested but also available.

The experts were reluctant to give their impressions on the transparency and the control of the process. Nevertheless, one expert stated in an indirect way that the Facilitators took a too dominant or directive role. This expert also reported that other scientists had been complaining about their little influence. But he clearly dissociated himself from this position. One can assume from the indirect statements that there were hidden tensions regarding the roles – and the influence – given to different actors of the process.

Citizens

The citizens assessed their opportunities of contribution as fair. They felt that their opinions were requested and they felt free to express themselves, also to utter critiques. Still, the unequal language (English) abilities were seen as a problematic distortion.

One citizen mentioned, that it was easier to contribute at the national level than at the European level. All citizens perceived the Second Convention as dominated by strict process rules and a strict time frame.

Table 5: Atmosphere, Involvement of Science as well as Citizens

	Internal Perspective	External Perspective	Citizens
Atmosphere	• Committed • Professional • Exhausting • Cheerful • Proud • Anger • Serious • Focused • Friendly • Cooperative	• Excellent atmosphere • High Commitment and European spirit	• Good atmosphere • Less European exchange because of the work-orientation on national groups • More convivial elements at the 1st Convention
Science	• Timing, positioning and expert input was evaluated as good and well balanced • Risk of influence by the scientists • Varying quality of experts • Unequal representation of scientific disciplines • Only experts of national level were involved, not resource persons of the European-level	• Timing successful • Experts' communicational skills were appropriate • Biased expert selection (not representative for scientific community, minority of social sciences)	• Sufficient and good base for their work • Less expert intervention at the very beginning and at the end • Importance of mere citizen interaction • One Recommendation was contributed by an expert • More expert intervention to inform about existing measures
Opportunity to contribute	• Fair and equal opportunity to contribute • Open and fair	• Fair and equal participation • Group dynamics	• Fair opportunity to contribute • Opinions and

	participation process in all levels	• Critical self-selection mechanism of citizen panel	critiques were requested
	• Critical point: narrow time frame Problem: final report was not written by citizens themselves		• Limitation: inequality of understanding • Contribution easier on national level
Transparency and Control	• Lack of Transparency • Time pressure and complexity caused translation problems, which led to dissatisfaction by the citizens	• Facilitators were characterized as too directive • Indication of hidden tensions regarding the roles	• Convention dominated by strict rules of time and procedures

2.2.15   Assessment of the National Syntheses Report

Internal Perspective

The National Synthesis Report was evaluated as being very clear and having useful reference of the process. Some Facilitators mentioned that the report was used to identify the major issues. Another aspect which should be considered was the lack of information about how things are organized in other countries, and what is going on at the European level.

2.2.16   Influence of the ECD-Project

Internal Perspective

Different points of views were mentioned by the question concerning the influence of the project to the European policy. The interviewed persons pointed out, that the project would have an impact, but only on a small amount of policy-makers. The policy-makers on European level got with the report a resource to legitimate their decisions. Furthermore, the policy-makers got to know, that citizens were very suspicious about pharmaceutical companies and their profits.

Other interviewed persons mentioned their doubt concerning a high impact of the ECD-Project regarding the European-policy and the research. But they were optimistic concerning the influence of the ECD-Project on further similar projects. It was emphasized that such conventions would belong to the political culture of the future. One method to integrate citizens in such kind of projects had been tested and future projects will benefit from the experiences, which were gained in the ECD-Project.

The project was evaluated as very positive and innovative concerning the aspect of public participation. The methods were felicitous and could have been transformed into other contexts. It was assumed by the interviewees that public participation through such deliberation projects will increase, because as the ECD-Project made visible: a constructive dialog between citizens from different European countries is possible.

The influence of the ECD-Project concerning the public understanding of sciences was characterized as revolutionary. The participants had the unique possibility to discuss with scientists and get a feeling of the scientists' perspective on brain sciences. The Citizens lost their fear regarding scientists and discussed on a very high level of competence. On the other hand, the scientists got an impression on the perceptions and assessments of the citizens. Before the discussions began, the citizens sceptically regarded experts and policy makers. The

interviewees mentioned that the project improved the awareness of complex issues and led to a better public understanding of science.

External Perspective

The stakeholders were cautious regarding their assessments of the influence of the ECD-Project, but they presented certain ideas on the question of, how a positive impact could be achieved and sustained. Additionally there was a considerable variance in opinions among the stakeholders.

Pessimistically, some considered the ECD-Project as not much more than a nice symbol. Others differentiated more and saw a possible influence if certain circumstances would have been fulfilled. Important aspects mentioned were how the report would be adopted by the Parliament and if it could activate the European Commission. Following the same line of argumentation, one expert even detected a possibility of influence by a common 'parliament-public-coalition of interest'. He stressed, that would be a big opportunity, because the Parliament has been looking for public' statements in search of legitimacy, which would increase the chances that the members of Parliament pick up the results to use them. Some stakeholders mentioned that the ECD-Project could be considered as a successful public participation in governance. They saw the possibility of the final report could having a substantial impact on the European decisions, especially regarding the research funding, which simultaneously would show a general public influence on governance.

But they didn't make assumptions on the potential of this kind of process to constitute more participatory elements in governance. Except for one scientist, who stressed the fact that ECD-Project would certainly have an impact on the people who were directly involved, i.e. especially on scientists. Those will be influenced in their perceptions of how science should be made and they will probably change their way of dealing with opinions of lay people. The ECD-Project is seen as a possible method coping with the changing status of science.

An impact on the society depends on the experts' view of the multiplication effect by the citizens on one hand, which some consider to be rather small, and on the dissemination of this process by the Media on the other hand. Even if the press conference was to be evaluated as disappointing by some stakeholders, the report could potentially find a lot of public interest.

Citizens

The citizens were not sure, but most of them hoped, that the ECD-Project would have an influence in general. The answers oscillated between positive and negative assessments, which was related to proudness and worries.

The citizens worried about the ECD-Project will having no influence at all, but the interviewees hoped the European policy would turn their attention on the citizens' statements. This tension was dissolved by statements of the following type: 'as the people initiated the ECD-Project and as they spend so much money on it, it should have an impact'. Furthermore, one citizen mentioned that his national government took notice on the final report.

As the impact on society was concerned, most citizens ascribed an active role as multiplication actors to themselves and reported about the efforts of their national panels.

The influence on public participation in governance was seen by the citizens as a function of the size of citizens included. A big number of citizens could have lead to more participation. Citizens felt that their opinions were heard in the project and considered public participation to be as essential. The citizens expressed, that they were able to contribute reasonable ideas, which were not incompatible with stakeholders' or experts' perceptions.

To have an impact on public understanding of science, more facilitation is required. The citizens were also optimistic, about that science and its knowledge being interesting for a larger public.

Table 6: Estimated Impact of the Project

	Internal Perspective	External Perspective	Citizens
European Policy	• Policy makers can use the report for legitimisation of decisions • Some doubts that the ECD-Project will have an influence to the European-policy and also the research in general.	• Great variance within the answers • Negative responses: "ECD is a nice symbol" • Possibility of substantial influence on European decisions • Possible influence, if European Parliament and Commission react • The coalition of interest between Parliament and citizens increases the possibility of influence	• Positive and negative assessments, expression of hope, that the ECD-Project will have an influence

Public understanding of science	• The influence of the ECD-Project concerning public understanding of sciences was characterized as revolutionary and very positive. • Citizens had the unique possibility to discuss with scientists in an exchange of perspectives.	• "Snowball effect" by the citizens will be rather small • Media as crucial factor • Press conference was evaluated as disappointing	• Citizens were proud • Citizens saw themselves as multiplication actors - some efforts of the national panels • Much potential, if more facilitation is made
Public Participation in Governance	• Very positive and innovative possibility for intercultural deliberation. • Methods were felicitous and could be transformed also in other contexts. • Enabling all participants was a very important experience. • Public participation will increase, because it was made visible, that participation in this kind of field is possible.	• Certain impact on research funding • ECD-Project as a possible method to cope with the changing status of science • Impact on persons involved (scientists)	• Inclusion of more citizens in projects like ECD is meaningful • Participation is demanded and assessed as essential • Demonstration of citizens' competence to discuss with experts and politicians

2.3   Interviews Summary

Generally, all interviewed persons assessed the used methodological design, the process and the achieved results as positive, but some critical aspects were mentioned, too. As detected in the analysis of interviews taken after the First Citizens Convention, a few differences occurred between the several actor groups regarding the general answer patterns. The Stakeholders and the citizens were slightly more focused on the results and the utility of the results, whereby the answers of the Internal Perspective (Facilitators, organisers) additionally highlighted methodological features. The answers of the Internal Perspective especially appeared to refer on a common base, which can be interpreted as an indication for a high involvement and close cooperation of all actors of this group during the preparation phase of the Second Citizens Convention. The basic finding, for instance, can be found in the answers concerning the major objectives.

The major objective in the eyes of the actors of the Internal Perspective consisted in the development of an adequate method for the realisation of a dialog between European citizens. The participants should have the opportunity to discuss brain science, whereby the process is to be supported by experts as resource persons. The handover of the participant's recommendatnions to policy-makers would also demonstrate that the European Citizens share a common base of values. The project was also assessed as a good exercise of democracy and participation.

As the prime objective the experts mentioned the consultation of the citizens on scientific issues, which was also perceived as a key element for the social control, acceptance and legitimacy of technology and especially of brain science as well as in regard to the funding.

The citizens emphasized the relevance of getting the opportunity for a discussion of commonalities and differences between national perspectives at the European level, which could be seen as a contribution

for the involvement of the public in the sciences. They also mentioned strengthening the publicity of brain science in general by this event.

All interviewees generally evaluated the ECD-Project as success. The atmosphere during the Second Convention, the inclusion of experts and the synthesis report as reference were highlighted as being the most positive aspects by all interviewees.

The actors of the Internal Perspective lauded the high commitment of the citizens as a very positive aspect. Coming from different nations, the participants demonstrated that they were able to come to common recommendations regarding a complex issue, which also indicated that common European values and interests do exist. In the eyes of the interviewees the ECD-Project fostered this European understanding. The project was evaluated as very positive and innovative concerning the aspect of public participation. The influence of the ECD-Project concerning the public understanding of sciences was characterized as revolutionary. But the actors also mentioned that the final success will depend partially on the question of, how the method can be implemented in other projects. The experts assessed the recommendations as a valuable result and saw the possibility of the final report having a substantial influence on the European decisions, especially regarding the research funding, which could simultaneously show a general public influence on governance. The citizens mainly mentioned a few key aspects as being a success. They worked together with citizens from other countries, what enriched their awareness of different European cultures and different perspectives. The ECD-Project was assessed as a very stimulating and positive personal experience. Most citizens ascribed an active role as multiplication actors to themselves. The citizens felt that their opinions had been heard during the project and considered public participation as essential.

From the Internal Perspective and also from the perspective of the experts, the communication between citizens and experts was evaluated as constructive for both sides. The citizens received the relevant information by the resource persons, which was seen as an enrich-

ment by the interviewed participants. The experts pointed out that they gained a very important and new awareness regarding the question of how citizens think and feel concerning brain sciences. The fact that experts could also have an influence on the citizen's perceptions instead of only giving information was evaluated as problematic even by the experts themselves. Some experts mentioned that the ECD-Project can be considered as a successful public participation in governance.

All interviewees criticized the rough structure of the Second Convention. The Internal Perspective mainly stressed the high time pressure which led to a lack of flexibility and to dissatisfaction not only of the citizens. The Carousel Design was evaluated as adequate and efficient to produce recommendations and to establish possibilities of participation. But the method should be improved. For instance, the sessions didn't allow the development of a real European discussion. One aspect of this problem was, that the citizens referred more to the Facilitator instead of discussing interactively. Some interviewees identified the very narrow time frame as another reason for the lack of discussion. Additionally, the interviewees mentioned problems regarding the translation. The discussed subjects were very complex, the translators sometimes had problems to ensuring the correct translation of the discussed aspects. This led to misunderstandings and finally to the frustration and the distrust of the citizens. The interviewees suggested to strengthen the European level of discourse by conducting more mixed tables of European citizens. Additionally, the interpreters could join these tables to gain a real discussion and correct translation. The lack of a sufficient number of long breaks also led to dissatisfaction and to a loss of motivation. It was suggested to vary the types of common activities, as it was already had been done by the painting exercise. This could facilitate the personal exchange instead of the mere discussion of rational approaches.

 Another critical aspect mentioned was the writing process. The citizens were not convinced that their statements were recorded correctly. The writing team used another writing style and citizens did

not find their own wording in the text. The voting process was also very confusing because the rules were not clear or improper. Additionally, the rules were changed a few times without informing the citizens about the reasons and the meaning of the new rules, which increased their distrust. Furthermore, the interviewees suggested anonymous voting to avoid effects of group pressure. The lack of transparency during the final process was also criticised. Most of the interviewees were not sure regarding the overall-impact of the ECD-Project as well as regarding the question of, if there was a real attention by policy-makers concerning the recommendations. The interviewed persons pointed out, that the project will probably have an influence, but only on a small amount of policy-makers. In this case, the report could being the source of legitimisation of decisions.

The Experts criticized English being the dominant language of the discussions, which led to frustration and mistrust of the citizens. Furthermore, they suggested integrating actors from the pharmaceutical industry to enable citizens to get knowledge about this perspective. The costs (also in time) and the complexity of the process were seen as obstacles against a regular application of this method.

The Citizens mainly criticized the narrow time frame and the dominance of the English language, which led to unequal opportunities of contributing statements. At the national meetings, citizens discussed more in detail and it was frustrating for them to lose relevant aspects by transferring and aggregating the discussed results on European level. The citizens mentioned, they would be not sure regarding the influence of their recommendations. Most of them hoped that the ECD-Project would have an influence.

Appendix

Interview guideline "Main Interviews"

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

Guide for Interviews

This is an interview about your impressions and your judgment about the 2nd Convention. We would also like to know your opinion on incidents that occurred during the meetings. The 18 items take approximately 15 to 20 minutes of your time. The interview will facilitate our task to conduct a fair and thorough external evaluation. Feel free to add explanations or comments at the end of the questionnaire if you feel it can assist our task of evaluation. All information will be kept confidential.

1. In your view, what are the major objectives of the ECD Project? Please be brief! If several: What do you think is the prime objective?

2. Esp., with respect to the objective/s of the Convention: Do you think the ECD-Project is a successful undertaking?

3. Are the results of the Convention in line with your expectations? Please be brief!

4. How would you evaluate the process of the 2nd Convention in view of the objectives you had mentioned above: Which elements of the process would you describe as effective or ineffective in relation to the objectives?
    Effective   Ineffective

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

4.1   If not mentioned: What do you think about the Carousel Method as central design?

5.   How would you describe your own role in reaching the objectives of the Convention? Please be brief!

6.   How do you attempt to meet this role (for us: "mediating strategy")? Please be brief!

7.   Do you feel well prepared for your work?

8.   Which main problems have you encountered so far? How did you/ persons in charge cope with these problems?
 Problems   Coping

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

    9.   What kind of problems do you expect in the future?

    10.   Regarding to your experiences during the Convention: Do you think the ECD process can facilitate and foster Euro-pean identity among the participants? Please be brief!

    11.   Can you give an assessment about the commitment of the Citizens? Please be brief!

    12.   How would you describe the atmosphere of the Convention, especially at your table / shere of action (-> fairness, ..)

    13.   How would you assess the preparation of the Citizens? (-> competence to discuss,)

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

14. ! How do you assess the incorporation of sciences into the ECD project? (Right point of time?) vs. When should Experts be included into a project like ECD?

15. ! On average: Do you think the citizens had a fair and equal opportunity to contribute to the discussion and the articula-tion of the results? (if not mentioned: ASK -> TRANS-PARECY & CONTROL)

16. Do you think that everybody is satisfied with the 2nd Convention?
    ➔ If not mentioned: Do you think especially the citizens are content with the a) results and b) the processes of the Convention?

17. How do you assess the National Syntheses Report (as basis for the Convention)?

18. !! Can you give us an estimation what influence the ECD-project (Meeting of Minds) will have on European policy, public participation in governance, public understanding of science?

This is the place to add your own comments and observations that can help us
to conduct a fair and thorough evaluation
Thank you for the conversation!

Interview guideline "Initial Interviews"

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

Guide for Interviews

This is an short interview for the external Evaluation about your impressions and your judgment about the ECD-Project (Meeting of Minds). It takes approximately 5 minutes of your time. We prepared a guideline to lead through the conversa-tion. Feel free to add explanations or com-ments at the end of the questionnaire if you feel it can assist our task of evalua-tion. All informa-tion will be kept confidential.

1.   In your view, what are the major objectives of the ECD-Project? Please be brief! If several: What do you think is the prime objective?

2.   Esp., with respect to the objective/s: Do you think the ECD-Project is a success?

3.   Which main problems have you encountered so far? How did you / persons in charge cope with these problems? -> Any Suggestions or Solutions?
Problems   Coping

Time, Date / Interview-Nr.	Name of Interviewee	Organisation

4.   What kind of problems do you expect in the future?

5.   How do you assess the incorporation of sciences into the ECD project? (Right time?) vs. When should Experts be included into a project like ECD?

6.   IF CITIZEN or person involed: How would you describe the atmosphere of the Convention? On average: Do you think the citizens had a fair and equal opportunity to contribute to the discussion and the articulation of the results? (if not mentioned: ASK -> TRANSPARECY & CONTROL)

7.   Can you give us an estimation what influence the ECD-project (Meeting of Minds) will have on European policy, public, public participation in governance, public understanding of science?

This is the place to add your own comments and observations that can help us to conduct a fair and thorough evaluation
Thank you for the conversation!

Dimensions of the Pre-structured Observation-Sheet

Nr.:	Time:		Table-Nr.:
F.- / M.-Ration:	Estimated Age:		Countries:
Type:	Issue:		
Atmosphere	Relaxed – Tense // Casual – Afflicted Tiredness/ Fatigue National differences – European identity		
Interaction	Trying to reach a synthesis or drifting apart Strategic vs. Communication oriented Interest coalitions/ Opinion groups Personal Interactions/ Attacks / Fairness Oppression/ Suppression Volume Absenteeism (spatial- behavioural)		
Discussion	Engaged - Interested – Bored Closed Argumentation Maps? Responsive to each other (Mono- vs. Dialogue) Factual or emotional discussion Consensus vs. Disagreement Reflections of the citizens		
Roles	based on experience, knowledge, morally, prestige (Dominant role))		
Opinion	Cognitive – Evaluative – Normative – Affective – Expressive		
Language	Language (Colloquial vs. Expert) Language problems Gestures and Facial Expressions		
Structure Facilitator (table)	Facilitators (Neutral vs. Catalytic = Constructive without influence on content vs. Synthetisation (Influence on content) Involvement of citizens in Decisions Transparency / Support for citizens Problems – Incidents		